arXiv:1411.4444v3 [math.OC] 28 Jul 2015

L-extendable functions and a proximity scaling algorithm for minimum cost multiflow problem

Hiroshi HIRAI
Department of Mathematical Informatics,
Graduate School of Information Science and Technology,
University of Tokyo, Tokyo, 113-8656, Japan.
hirai@mist.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp

July 29, 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we develop a theory of new classes of discrete convex functions, called L-extendable functions and alternating L-convex functions, defined on the product of trees. We establish basic properties for optimization: a local-to-global optimality criterion, the steepest descend algorithm by successive k-submodular function minimizations, the persistency property, and the proximity theorem. Our theory is motivated by minimum cost free multiflow problem. To this problem, Goldberg and Karzanov gave two combinatorial weakly polynomial time algorithms based on capacity and cost scalings, without explicit running time. As an application of our theory, we present a new simple polynomial proximity scaling algorithm to solve minimum cost free multiflow problem in $O(n \log(nAC)\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$ time, where n is the number of nodes, m is the number of edges, k is the number of terminals, A is the maximum of edge-costs, C is the total sum of edge-capacities, and $\mathrm{MF}(n', m')$ denotes the time complexity to find a maximum flow in a network of n' nodes and m' edges. Our algorithm is designed to solve, in the same time complexity, a more general class of multiflow problems, minimum cost node-demand multiflow problem, and is the first combinatorial polynomial time algorithm to this class of problems. We also give an application to network design problem.

1 Introduction

An *$L^\natural$-convex function* (Favati-Tardella [7], Murota [36], Fujishige-Murota [13]) is a function g on integer lattice $\mathbf{Z}^n$ satisfying so-called *discrete midpoint convexity inequality*:

$$g(x) + g(y) \geq g(\lfloor (x+y)/2 \rfloor) + g(\lceil (x+y)/2 \rceil) \quad (x, y \in \mathbf{Z}^n), \tag{1.1}$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ (resp. $\lceil \cdot \rceil$) is an operation on $\mathbf{R}^n$ that rounds down (resp. up) the decimal fraction of each component. $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex functions may be viewed as a $\mathbf{Z}^n$-generalization of *submodular functions*, and constitute a fundamental class of discrete convex functions in *discrete convex analysis* (Murota [37]). A representative example of $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex function is a function g represented as the following form:

$$g(x) = \sum_i g_i(x_i) + \sum_{i,j} h_{ij}(x_i - x_j) \quad (x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbf{Z}^n), \tag{1.2}$$

where g_i and h_{ij} are one-dimensional convex functions. The minimization of such a function has both theoretical and practical interests; it is the dual of a minimum cost network flow problem, and has important applications in computer vision [32]. Thus theory of $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex functions provides a unified treatment for optimizing these important classes of functions.

Let us mention some of particular features of $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex functions g. (1) An optimality criterion of a local-to-global type [37, Theorem 7.14]: For each point $x \in \mathbf{Z}^n$, a local minimization problem around x is defined, and if x is local optimal, then x is global optimal. Moreover this local minimization problem is a *submodular function minimization*, and is solvable in polynomial time [16, 23, 40]. In particular, if x is not local optimal, then we can find another point y with $g(y) < g(x)$; we naturally obtain y with smallest $g(y)$. The resulting descent algorithm, called the *steepest descent algorithm*, correctly outputs a global minimizer of g [37, Section 10.3.1]. The number of the descent steps is the l_∞-distance between the initial point and global minimizers [32, 38]. (2) Proximity theorem (Iwata-Shigeno [25], see [37, Theorem 7.18]): For a minimizer x over the set $(2\mathbf{Z})^n$ of all even integral vectors, there is a global minimizer y in the l_∞-ball around x with radius n. This intriguing property is the basis of the proximity scaling algorithm for $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex functions [37, Section 10.3.2].

Recently the L-convexity is considered for functions on general graph structures other than $\mathbf{Z}^n$. Observe that $\mathbf{Z}$ is naturally identified with the vertex set of a directed path (of infinite length), and a function on $\mathbf{Z}^n$ is regarded as a function on the n-product of these paths. Observe that operations $\lceil, \rceil$ and $\lfloor, \rfloor$ are definable in a graph-theoretical way. Hence $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex functions are well-defined functions on the Cartesian product of directed paths. Based on this observation, Kolmogorov [31] considered an analogue of $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex functions defined on the product of rooted trees, called *tree-submodular functions*. Hirai [18, 19] considered an analogue of $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex functions on a more general structure, a *modular complex*, which is a structure obtained by gluing of modular lattices. His motivation comes from the tractability classification of minimum 0-extension problems and a combinatorial duality theory of multicommodity flows.

In this paper, we continue this line of research. We introduce the notion of *L-extendability* for functions on (the vertex set of) the n-fold Cartesian product T^n of trees T. This notion is inspired by the idea of *submodular relaxation* [15, 26, 30] and related half-integral relaxations of NP-hard problems, such as vertex cover and multiway cut. We first introduce a variation of a tree-submodular function, called an *alternating L-convex function*. Alternating L-convex functions are also defined by a variation of the discrete midpoint convexity inequality (2.2), and coincide with Fujishige's *UJ-convex functions* [11] if T is a path and is identified with $\mathbf{Z}$. As an analogue of half-integral integer lattice $(\mathbf{Z}/2)^n$, we consider the product $(T^*)^n$ of the *edge-subdivision* T^* of T. Then an *L-extendable function* is defined as a function g on T^n such that there is an alternating L-convex function $\bar{g}$ on $(T^*)^n$ such that its restriction to T^n is equal to g, where $\bar{g}$ is called an *L-convex relaxation* of g.

The first half of our main contribution is to establish basic properties of alternating L-convex functions and L-extendable functions. We show that alternating L-convex functions admit an optimality criterion of a local-to-global type. Here the local problem is the problem of minimizing a *k-submodular function*, a generalization of submodular and bisubmodular functions introduced by Huber and Kolmogorov [22]. This optimality criterion is an immediate consequence of the definition, and may not be precisely new; it is expected from [18, 31]. We further prove the l_∞-geodesic property for the steepest descent algorithm for alternating L-convex functions: The number of the iterations is equal to the l_∞-distance from the initial point to minimizers. We establish the proximity theorem for L-extendable functions: Regard T as a bipartite graph with two color classes B, W. For a minimizer x over B^n, there is a global minimizer of g within the l_∞-ball around x with radius n. We prove the persistency property for L-convex relaxations: a minimizer of an L-extendable function is obtained by *rounding* any minimizer of its L-convex relaxation. This property is known for the cases of bisubmodular and k-submodular relaxations [15, 26, 30]. We introduce a useful special class of L-extendable functions, called *2-separable convex functions*, as an analogue of a class of functions with form (2.2). We give explicit L-convex relaxations for which the steepest descent algorithm is implementable by a maximum flow algorithm. In fact, the local problem

is a minimization of a special k-submodular function, which is a sum of (binary) *basic k-submodular functions*, introduced by Iwata, Wahlström, and Yoshida [26]. They showed that this class of k-submodular functions can be minimized by maximum flow computation. Therefore the L-convex relaxation of a 2-separable convex function is efficiently minimized. For some cases, an optimal solution of this relaxation can easily be rounded to a 2-approximate solution of the original 2-separable convex function. This approximation algorithm can be viewed as a generalization of the classical 2-approximation algorithm for multiway cut [6].

These results are motivated by the design of a new simple polynomial scaling algorithm for *minimum cost free multiflow problem*, which is the second half of our main contribution. For an undirected (integer-)capacitated network with terminal set S, a *multiflow* is a pair of a set of paths connecting terminals in S and its flow-value function satisfying capacity constraints. A *maximum free multiflow* is a multiflow of a maximum total flow-value. Suppose that each edge has a nonnegative cost. The minimum cost free multiflow problem asks to find a maximum free multiflow with the minimum total cost. Karzanov [28] proved that there always exists a half-integral minimum cost maximum free multiflow, and presented a pseudo-polynomial time algorithm to find it. Later he [29] gave a strongly polynomial time algorithm by using a generic polynomial time LP solver (the ellipsoid method or the interior point method). Currently no *purely combinatorial* strongly polynomial time algorithm is known. Goldberg and Karzanov [14] presented two purely combinatorial weakly polynomial time algorithms: one of them is based on capacity scaling and the other one is based on cost scaling. However the description and analysis of their algorithms (in each scaling phase) are not easy; they did not give an explicit polynomial running time.

As an application of the theory of L-extendable functions, we present a new simple purely combinatorial polynomial time scaling algorithm. We hope that our algorithm will be a step toward the design of a purely combinatorial strongly polynomial time algorithm for minimum cost multiflow problem. We formulate a dual of our problem to the minimization of a 2-separable L-convex function on the product T^n of a subdivided-star T, where a *subdivided star* is a tree obtained from a star by successive edge-subdivisions. Then we can apply a domain scaling technique. The scaled problem in each phase is again a minimization of a 2-separable L-convex function, and is solved by the steepest descent algorithm implemented by max-flow computations. The number of iterations is estimated by the proximity theorem the l_∞-geodesic property, and the persistency property. In the last phase, we obtain an optimal dual solution, and from this we can construct a desired minimum cost free multiflow. Our algorithm may be viewed as a multiflow version of a proximity scaling (or domain scaling) algorithm for the convex dual of minimum cost flow problem [1, 32], and is the first combinatorial algorithm to this problem having an explicit polynomial running time. The total time is $O(n \log(nAC)\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$, where n is the number of nodes, m is the number of edges, k is the number of terminals, A is the maximum of an edge-cost, C is the total sum of edge-capacities, and $\mathrm{MF}(n', m')$ is the time complexity of finding a maximum flow in a network of n' nodes and m' edges.

Our algorithm is designed to solve, in the same time complexity, a more general class of multiflow problems, *minimum cost node-demand multiflow problems*, and is the first combinatorial polynomial time algorithm for this class of the problems. This multiflow problem arises as an LP-relaxation of a class of network design problems, called *terminal backup problems* [2, 3, 43]. Recently Fukunaga [9] gave a 4/3-approximation algorithm for capacitated terminal backup problem, based on rounding an LP solution (obtained by a generic LP-solver). Our algorithm gives a practical and combinatorial implementation of his algorithm.

We present results for L-extendable functions in Section 2 and results for minimum cost multiflow problem in Section 3.

Notation. Let $\mathbf{R}$, $\mathbf{R}_+$, $\mathbf{Z}$, and $\mathbf{Z}_+$ denote the sets of reals, nonnegative reals, integers, and nonnegative integers, respectively. Let $\overline{\mathbf{R}} := \mathbf{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, where ∞ is an infinity element and is treated as: $x < \infty$ ($x \in \mathbf{R}$) and $\infty + x = \infty$ ($x \in \overline{\mathbf{R}}$).

For a function $f : E \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ on a set E, let $\operatorname{dom} f$ denote the set of elements $x \in E$ with $f(x) \neq \infty$. For a subset $X \subseteq E$, let $f(X)$ denote $\sum_{x \in X} f(x)$.

For an undirected (directed) graph $G = (V, E)$, an edge between nodes i and j (from i to j) is denoted by ij. For a node subset X, let δX denote the set of edges ij with $i \in X$ and $j \notin X$. For nodes s, t, an (s,t)-*cut* is a node subset X with $s \in X \not\ni t$. For a node subset A, an (s, A)-cut is a node subset X with $s \in X \subseteq V \setminus A$.

2 L-extendable functions

In this section, we introduce alternating L-convex functions and L-extendable functions on the product of trees. In Section 2.1, we give preliminary arguments on k-submodular functions. In Section 2.2, we introduce alternating L-convex functions, and establish the L-optimality criterion (Theorem 2.5) and the l_∞-geodesic property (Theorem 2.6) of the steepest descent algorithm. In Section 2.3, we introduce L-extendable functions, and establish the proximity theorem (Theorem 2.11) and the persistency property (Theorem 2.10). In Section 2.4, we introduce 2-separable convex functions. We show that the steepest descent algorithm for their L-convex relaxations is implementable by minimum cut computations (Theorems 2.15 and 2.16). Less obvious theorems are proved in Section 2.5.

2.1 Preliminaries on $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular function

For a nonnegative integer k, let S_k be a $(k+1)$-element set with specified element 0. Define a partial order $\preceq$ on S_k by $0 \prec u$ for $u \in S_k \setminus \{0\}$ with no other relations. Then S_k is a meet-semilattice of minimum element 0; in particular meet $\wedge$ exists. For $u, v \in S_k$, define $u \sqcup v$ by $u \sqcup v := u \vee v$ if u, v are comparable, and $u \sqcup v := 0$ otherwise. For an n-tuple $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_n)$ of nonnegative integers, let $S_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ denote the direct product $S_{k_1} \times S_{k_2} \times \cdots \times S_{k_n}$ of posets S_{k_i} $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$. For $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n), y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \in S_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, let $x \wedge y := (x_1 \wedge y_1, x_2 \wedge y_2, \ldots, x_n \wedge y_n)$ and $x \sqcup y := (x_1 \sqcup y_1, x_2 \sqcup y_2, \ldots, x_n \sqcup y_n)$.

Definition 2.1 ([22]). $f : S_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ is $\boldsymbol{k}$-*submodular* if it satisfies

$$f(x) + f(y) \geq f(x \wedge y) + f(x \sqcup y) \quad (x, y \in S_{\boldsymbol{k}}).$$

The notion of $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodularity is introduced by Huber-Kolmogorov [22]. If $\boldsymbol{k} = (k, k, \ldots, k)$, then $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions are particularly called k-submodular. Then 1-submodular functions are submodular functions, and 2-submodular functions are bisubmodular functions. Although both classes of functions can be minimized in polynomial time (under the oracle model) [12, 16, 23, 35, 39, 40], it is not known whether general $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions can be minimized in polynomial time. Recently, Thapper and Živný [42] discovered a powerful criterion for solvability of *valued CSP*, that is, a minimization of a function represented as a sum of functions with constant arity (= the number of variables). As a consequence of their criterion, if $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular function f is represented and given as

$$f(x) = \sum_i f_i(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots, x_{i_m}) \quad (x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in S_{\boldsymbol{k}}),$$

where each f_i is $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular and the number m of variables is constant, then f can be minimized by solving a certain polynomial size linear program (BLP); see also [33].

We will deal with a further special class of $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions, considered by [26], in which this class of $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions can be efficiently minimized by a maximum flow

algorithm. Let k, k' be nonnegative integers. For $a \in S_k$, let ϵ_a and θ_a be one-dimensional k-submodular functions on S_k defined by

$$\epsilon_a(u) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u = a \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad \theta_a(u) := \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } u = a \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } u = 0, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (u \in S_k).$$

It is not difficult to see that any one-dimensional k-submodular function f is a nonnegative sum of ϵ_a and θ_a plus a constant:

$$f = f(0) + (f(0) - f(a))\theta_a + \sum_{b \in S_k \setminus \{0,a\}} (f(b) - 2f(0) + f(a))\epsilon_b, \tag{2.1}$$

where a is a minimizer of f over S_k. For $(a, a') \in S_k \times S_{k'}$, let $\mu_{a,a'}$ be a function on $S_k \times S_{k'}$ defined by

$$\mu_{a,a'}(u,v) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u = a \neq 0 \text{ or } v = a' \neq 0 \text{ or } u = v = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } v = 0 \neq u \neq a \text{ or } u = 0 \neq v \neq a', \\ 2 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad ((u,v) \in S_k \times S_{k'}).$$

For a poset isomorphism $\sigma : S_k \to S_{k'}$ (a bijection from S_k to $S_{k'}$ with $\sigma(0) = 0$), let δ_σ be a function on $S_k \times S_{k'}$ defined by

$$\delta_\sigma(u,v) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v = \sigma(u), \\ 1 & \text{if } |\{u,v\} \cap \{0\}| = 1, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad ((u,v) \in S_k \times S_{k'}).$$

If σ is the identity map id, then δ_{id} is denoted by δ.

Observe that both $\mu_{a,a'}$ and δ_σ are $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular. A (binary) *basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular function* f on $S_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ for $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_n)$ is a function represented as

Type I: $f(x) = f'(x_i)$ for some i and one-dimensional k-submodular function $f' : S_{k_i} \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$,

Type II: $f(x) = \delta_\sigma(x_i, x_j)$ for distinct i, j and an isomorphism $\sigma : S_{k_i} \to S_{k_j}$, or

Type III: $f(x) = \mu_{a,a'}(x_i, x_j)$ for distinct i, j and $(a, a') \in S_{k_i} \times S_{k_j}$.

Iwata, Wahlström, and Yoshida [26] showed that a sum of basic k-submodular function can be efficiently minimized by any maximum flow algorithm.

Theorem 2.2 ([26, Section 6])**.** *A nonnegative sum of m basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions for $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_n)$ can be minimized in $O(\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$ time, where $k := \max k_i$.*

Their algorithm is sketched as follows. Suppose that $S_{k_i} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, k_i\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. We consider a directed network $\mathcal{N}$ with vertex set U, edge set A, and edge capacity $c : A \to \mathbf{R}_+$, where U consists of source s, sink t, and $v_i^1, v_i^2, \ldots, v_i^{k_i}$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$. Let $U_i := \{v_i^1, v_i^2, \ldots, v_i^{k_i}\}$. A *legal cut* is an (s,t)-cut X such that $|X \cap U_i| \leq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. There is a natural bijection ϕ from $S_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ to the set of legal cuts, where ϕ is given by

$$\phi(x) := \{s\} \cup \{v_i^{x_i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, x_i \neq 0\} \quad (x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in S_{\boldsymbol{k}}).$$

For an (s,t)-cut X, let $\check{X}$ denote the legal cut obtained from X by deleting $U_i \cap X$ with $|U_i \cap X| \geq 2$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. We say that network $\mathcal{N}$ *represents* function $f : S_{\boldsymbol{k}} \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ if

(1) for some constant K, it holds $f(x) = c(\delta\phi(x)) + K$ for every $x \in S_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, and

(2) $c(\delta\check{X}) \leq c(\delta X)$ for every (s,t)-cut X.

Suppose that $\mathcal{N}$ represents f. By (1) and (2), the minimum of $f+K$ is equal to the minimum (s,t)-cut capacity, and some legal cut is a minimum (s,t)-cut. By $\check{X} \subseteq X$ and (2), any inclusion-minimal minimum (s,t)-cut is necessarily a legal cut. Recall the fundamental fact in network flow theory that there is a unique inclusion-minimal mincut X^*, which is equal to the set of vertices reachable from s in the residual network for any maximum (s,t)-flow. Then $x^* := \phi^{-1}(X)$ is a minimizer of f. Namely f is minimized by a single max-flow computation on $\mathcal{N}$.

As shown in [26], any nonnegative sum of basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions is represented by some network $\mathcal{N}$. Notice that if f is represented by $\mathcal{N} = (U, A, c)$, then for constants $\alpha > 0$ and β, $\alpha f + \beta$ is represented by $\mathcal{N}' = (U, A, \alpha c)$, and that if f and f' are represented by networks $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{N}'$ (on the same vertex set U), respectively, then $f + f'$ is represented by the union of $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{N}'$. Also notice that a unary $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular function f is decomposed to θ_a and ϵ_b as (2.1). If $f(0) = \infty$, then there is at most one $u \in S_k$ with $u \in \operatorname{dom} f$, and the coordinate x_i of term $f(x_i)$ may be fixed to u. So we can assume that $f(0) \in \operatorname{dom} f$. Therefore it suffices to construct a network for the following cases of f: (i_0) $f(x) = \infty$ if $x_i = u \neq 0$ and 0 otherwise, (i) $f(x) = \epsilon_a(x_i)$ $(a \neq 0)$, (ii) $f(x) = \theta_a(x_i)$, (iii) $f(x) = \delta_\sigma(x_i, x_j)$, and (iv) $f(x) = \mu_{a,a'}(x_i, x_j)$.

Case (i_0): Consider the network consisting of a single edge $v_i^u t$ with infinite capacity.

Case (i): Consider the network consisting of a single edge $v_i^a t$ with unit capacity.

Case (ii): If $a = 0$, then f is the sum of $\epsilon_{a'}$, and reduces to case (i). Suppose that $a \neq 0$. Consider the network consisting of edges $s v_i^a$ and $v_i^j t$ for $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k_i\} \setminus \{a\}$.

Case (iii): Consider the network consisting of edges joining v_i^u and $v_j^{\sigma(u)}$ in both directions for $u = 1, 2, \ldots, k_i (= k_j)$.

Case (iv): If $a = a' = 0$, then f is the sum of two unary k-submodular functions, and reduces to case (i). So suppose $a \neq 0$. Consider the network consisting of edges $v_j^u v_i^a$ for $u \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k_j\} \setminus \{a'\}$ and $v_i^u v_j^{a'}$ for $u \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k_i\} \setminus \{a\}$ if $a' \neq 0$.

In all four cases, it is easy to check that the network represents f, i.e., it satisfies (1) and (2). In particular, each basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular function is represented by $O(k)$ edges, where $k = \max_i k_i$. Thus a nonnegative sum of m basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions is represented by a network with $O(kn)$ vertices and $O(km)$ edges. Hence it can be minimized by $O(\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$ time.

2.2 Alternating L-convex functions

Here we introduce the notion of an alternating L-convex function on the product of trees. Alternating L-convex functions may be viewed as a natural variant of *strongly tree-submodular functions* due to Kolmogorov [31]; see Remark 2.13 for a detailed relation. In addition, when $\mathbf{Z}^n$ is identified with (the vertex set) of the n-fold product of a path with infinite length, alternating L-convex functions are equal to *UJ-convex functions* considered by Fujishige [11]. Also alternating L-convex functions constitutes a useful special class of *L-convex functions on modular complexes* [18, 19], in which a modular complex are taken to be the product of zigzag oriented trees.

Let T be a tree. We will use the following convention:

The vertex set of a tree T is also denoted by T.

The exact meaning will always be clear in this context. Regard T as a bipartite graph. Let B and W be the color classes of T, where a vertex in B is called *black* and a vertex in W is called *white*. Define a partial order $\preceq$ on T by: $u \prec v$ if u and v are adjacent with $(u, v) \in W \times B$. Then the resulting poset has no chain of length 2; B and W are the sets of maximal and minimal elements, respectively. Let d denote the path metric of T, i.e., $d(u, v)$ is the number of edges in the unique path between u and v. For vertices $u, v \in T$, there uniquely exists

a pair (a, b) of vertices such that $d(u, v) = d(u, a) + d(a, b) + d(b, v)$, $d(u, a) = d(b, v)$, and $d(a, b) \leq 1$. In particular, $a = b$ or a and b are adjacent. Define $u \bullet v$ and $u \circ v$ so that $\{u \bullet v, u \circ v\} = \{a, b\}$ and $u \circ v \preceq u \bullet v$. Namely if $a = b$ then $u \bullet v = u \circ v = a = b$. Otherwise $u \bullet v$ and $u \circ v$ are the black and white vertices in $\{a, b\}$, respectively.

Let n be a positive integer. We consider the n-fold Cartesian product T^n of T. We will use the l_∞-metric on T^n, which is also denoted by d:

$$d(x, y) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d(x_i, y_i) \quad (x, y \in T^n).$$

Definition 2.3. A function $g : T^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ is called *alternating L-convex*, or simply, *L-convex* if it satisfies

$$g(x) + g(y) \geq g(x \bullet y) + g(x \circ y) \quad (x, y \in T^n). \tag{2.2}$$

The defining inequality (2.2) can be viewed as a variation of the discrete midpoint convexity (1.1); see also Remark 2.13. As the direct product of posets T, we regard T^n as a poset, where the partial order is also denoted by $\preceq$. For $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in T^n$, the principal ideal $\mathcal{I}(x) := \{y \in T^n \mid y \preceq x\}$ and filter $\mathcal{F}(x) := \{y \in T^n \mid y \succeq x\}$ of x are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}(x) &= \mathcal{I}(x_1) \times \mathcal{I}(x_2) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{I}(x_n), \\
\mathcal{F}(x) &= \mathcal{F}(x_1) \times \mathcal{F}(x_2) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{F}(x_n), \\
\mathcal{I}(x_i) &= \begin{cases} \{x_i\} \cup \{\text{all neighbors of } x_i\} & \text{if } x_i \in B, \\ \{x_i\} & \text{if } x_i \in W, \end{cases} \\
\mathcal{F}(x_i) &= \begin{cases} \{x_i\} \cup \{\text{all neighbors of } x_i\} & \text{if } x_i \in W, \\ \{x_i\} & \text{if } x_i \in B. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Regard $\mathcal{I}(x_i)$ as poset S_{k_i} with $k_i := |\mathcal{I}(x_i)| - 1$ and the minimum element x_i, and also regard $\mathcal{F}(x_i)$ as poset $S_{k'_i}$ with $k'_i := |\mathcal{F}(x_i)| - 1$ and the minimum element x_i. Then $\mathcal{I}(x) \simeq S_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ for $\boldsymbol{k} = (k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_n)$ and $\mathcal{F}(x) \simeq S_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ for $\boldsymbol{k} = (k'_1, k'_2, \ldots, k'_n)$. By this correspondence, it is easy to see that $\bullet = \sqcup$ and $\circ = \wedge$ on $\mathcal{F}(x)$, and that $\circ = \sqcup$ and $\bullet = \wedge$ on $\mathcal{I}(x)$. Therefore we have:

Lemma 2.4. *For each $x \in T^n$, an L-convex function g is $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular on $\mathcal{I}(x)$ and on $\mathcal{F}(x)$.*

In particular, in the case where T is a star with k leaves and center $x_0 \in W$, under the correspondence $T^n = \mathcal{F}(x_0)^n \simeq {S_k}^n$, L-convex functions and k-submodular functions are the same.

The following is an analogue of the L-optimality criterion of L$^\natural$-convex functions [37, Theorem 7.5] (and strongly-tree submodular function [31]):

Theorem 2.5 (L-optimality)**.** *Let g be an L-convex function on T^n. If $x \in \operatorname{dom} g$ is not a minimizer of g, then there exists $x' \in \mathcal{I}(x) \cup \mathcal{F}(x)$ with $g(x') < g(x)$.*

Proof. There is y with $g(y) < g(x)$. Take such y with $d(x, y)$ minimum. By inequality (2.2), we have $2g(x) > g(x) + g(y) \geq g(x \bullet y) + g(x \circ y)$. Thus $g(x \bullet y) < g(x)$ or $g(x \circ y) < g(x)$ holds. By the minimality, it must hold $d(x, y) \leq 1$ (since $d(y, x \bullet y) \leq \lceil d(x, y)/2 \rceil$ and $d(y, x \circ y) \leq \lceil d(x, y)/2 \rceil$). Then $x \bullet y \in \mathcal{F}(x)$, $x \circ y \in \mathcal{I}(x)$, and the claim holds. □

This directly implies the following descent algorithm, which is an analogue of the steepest descent algorithm of L$^\natural$-convex functions [37, Section 10.3.1].

Steepest descent algorithm:

Input: An L-convex function g and a vertex $x \in \operatorname{dom} g$.

Step 1: Let y be a minimizer of g over $\mathcal{I}(x) \cup \mathcal{F}(x)$.

Step 2: If $g(x) = g(y)$, then stop. Otherwise $x := y$, and go to step 1.

By Theorem 2.5, if the algorithm terminates in step 2, then x is a minimizer of g. Also the step 1 is conducted by minimizing g over $\mathcal{I}(x)$ and g over $\mathcal{F}(x)$. By Lemma 2.4, g is $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular on $\mathcal{I}(x)$ and on $\mathcal{F}(x)$, and step 1 can be conducted by $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular function minimization. Therefore, if g is represented as a sum of $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions of bounded arity, then each iteration is conducted in polynomial time. To obtain a complexity bound, we need to estimate the total number of iterations. In the case of $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex functions, the number of iterations is bounded by the constant of the l_∞-diameter of the effective domain [32]. A recent analysis [38] showed that the number of iterations is *exactly* equal to the minimum of a certain directed analogue of l_∞-distance from the initial point x to the set of minimizers.

We will establish an analogous result for our L-convex function. Let $\mathrm{opt}(g)$ denote the set of all minimizers of g. Obviously the total number of the iterations is at least the minimum l_∞-distance $d(\mathrm{opt}(g), x) := \min\{d(y, x) \mid y \in \mathrm{opt}(g)\}$ from x to $\mathrm{opt}(g)$. This lower bound is almost tight, as follows.

Theorem 2.6. *For an L-convex function g on T^n and a vertex $x \in \operatorname{dom} g$, the total number m of the iterations of the steepest descent algorithm applied to (g, x) is at most $d(\mathrm{opt}(g), x) + 2$. If $g(x) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{F}(x)} g(y)$ or $g(x) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{I}(x)} g(y)$, then $m = d(\mathrm{opt}(g), x)$.*

In the case where $x \in B^n$ or W^n, the condition $g(x) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{F}(x)} g(y)$ or $g(x) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{I}(x)} g(y)$ is automatically satisfied. In fact, [19] announced (a slightly weaker version of) this result for general L-convex functions on modular complexes. However, the proof needs a deep geometric investigation on modular complex, and will be given in a future paper [20]. We give a self-contained proof of Theorem 2.6 in Section 2.5.1.

2.3 L-extendable functions

Next we introduce the notion of the L-extendability. This notion was inspired by the idea of *(k-)submodular relaxation* used in [15, 26, 30].

Definition 2.7. A function $h : B^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ is called *L-extendable* if there exists an L-convex function g on T^n such that the restriction of g to B^n is equal to h.

We also define the L-extendability of a function on T^n via the edge-subdivision. The *edge-subdivision* T^* of T is obtained by adding a new vertex w_{uv} for each edge $e = uv$, and replacing e in T by two edges $uw_{uv}, w_{uv}v$. The new vertex w_{uv} is called the *midpoint* of uv. The original T is a subset of T^* and is one of the color classes of T^*. In T^*, vertices in T are supposed to be black and midpoints are supposed to be white.

Definition 2.8. A function $h : T^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ is called *midpoint L-extendable*, or simply, *L-extendable* if there exists an L-convex function g on $(T^*)^n$ such that the restriction of g to T^n is equal to h.

We call g an *L-convex relaxation* of h. If $\min_{x \in T^n} g(x) = \min_{x \in (T^*)^n} h(x)$, then g is called an *exact* L-convex relaxation. In fact, any L-convex function admits an exact L-convex relaxation, and is (midpoint) L-extendable [20]; see Remark 2.13 for related arguments. We will see that vertex-cover problem and multiway cut problem admits k-submodular relaxation (L-convex relaxation in our sense). This means that it is NP-hard to minimize L-extendable functions in general. However L-extendable functions have several useful properties. The main results in this section are following three properties of L-extendable functions. These properties will play crucial roles in the proximity scaling algorithm for minimum cost multiflow problem in Section 3. Proofs of the three theorems are given in Section 2.5.

The first property is an optimality criterion analogous to Theorem 2.5:

Theorem 2.9 (Optimality). *Let $h : B^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ be an L-extendable function. For $x \in \operatorname{dom} h$, if x is not a minimizer of h, then there exists $y \in B^n$ such that $d(x, y) \leq 2$ and $h(y) < h(x)$.*

The second property is so-called the *persistency*. This notion was introduced by Kolmogorov [30] for bisubmodular relaxation, and was extended to k-submodular relaxation [15, 26]. The persistency property says that from a minimizer x of a relaxation g, we obtain a minimizer y of h by *rounding* each white component of x to an adjacent (black) vertex.

Theorem 2.10 (Persistency). *Let $h : B^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ be an L-extendable function and $g : T^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ its L-convex relaxation. For a minimizer x of g, then there is a minimizer y of h with $y \in \mathcal{F}(x) \cap B^n$.*

The third one is a proximity theorem. The proximity theorem of L$^\natural$-convex function $g : \mathbf{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ says that for any minimizer x of g over $(2\mathbf{Z})^n$, there is a minimizer y of g with $\|x - y\|_\infty \leq n$ (Iwata-Shigeno [25]; see [37, Theorem 7.6] and [10, Theorem 20.10]). We establish an analogous result for L-extendable functions.

Theorem 2.11 (Proximity). *Let $h : T^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ be a midpoint L-extendable function, and let x be a minimizer of h over B^n. Then there exists a minimizer y of h with $d(x, y) \leq 2n$. In addition, if h admits an exact L-convex relaxation, then there exists a minimizer y of h with $d(x, y) \leq n$*

Example 2.12 (Vertex cover). As noted in [30], vertex cover problem is a representative example admitting a bisubmodular relaxation (L-convex relaxation in our sense). Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with (nonnegative) cost a on $V = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. A *vertex cover* is a set X of vertices meeting every edge. The vertex cover problem asks to find a vertex cover X of minimum cost $a(X)$. The well-known IP formulation of this problem is: Minimize $\sum_{i \in V} a(i)x_i$ over $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ satisfying $x_i + x_j \geq 1$ for $ij \in E$. Define $I_{\geq 1} : \mathbf{R} \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ by $I_{\geq 1}(z) = 0$ if $z \geq 1$ and ∞ otherwise, and define $\omega : \{0, 1\}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ by $\omega(x) := \sum_{i \in V} a(i)x_i + \sum_{ij \in E} I_{\geq 1}(x_i + x_j)$. Then the vertex cover problem is the minimization of ω. This function ω is midpoint L-extendable (if $\{0, 1\}$ is identified with the vertex set of the graph of single edge). Indeed, the natural extension $\bar{\omega} : \{0, 1/2, 1\}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ is a bisubmodular relaxation (if $\{0, 1/2, 1\}$ is identified with S_2 with $0 \succ 1/2 \prec 1$).

The *submodular vertex cover problem* [24] is to minimize submodular function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ over $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ satisfying $x_i + x_j \geq 1$ for $ij \in E$. Namely this is the minimization of ω defined by $\omega(x) = f(x) + \sum_{ij \in E} I_{\geq 1}(x_i + x_j)$. Again ω is midpoint L-extendable. Indeed a function $x \mapsto (f(\lceil x \rceil) + f(\lfloor x \rfloor))/2 + \sum_{ij \in E} I_{\geq 1}(x_i + x_j)$ is a bisubmodular relaxation of ω.

Remark 2.13. We can consider several variants of the discrete midpoint convexity inequality and associated discrete convex functions. Suppose that each edge of T has an orientation. Let $\mathrm{mid} : T \times T \to T^*$ be defined by: $\mathrm{mid}(p, q)$ is the unique vertex $u \in T^*$ with $d(p, u) = d(u, q)$ and $d(p, u) + d(u, q) = d(p, q)$. For $u \in T^* \setminus T$, let $\overline{u}$ and $\underline{u}$ denote the vertices of T such that $\overline{u}\underline{u}$ is an edge with midpoint u, and is oriented from $\overline{u}$ to $\underline{u}$. For $u \in T$, let $\overline{u} = \underline{u} := u$. Extend these operations to operations on T^n in componentwise, as above. Consider function g satisfying

$$g(x) + g(y) \geq g(\overline{\mathrm{mid}(x, y)}) + g(\underline{\mathrm{mid}(x, y)}) \quad (x, y \in T^n). \tag{2.3}$$

In the case where T is a path on $\mathbf{Z}$ obtained by joining i and $i + 1$ and by orienting $i \to i + 1$ ($i \in \mathbf{Z}$), the above inequality (2.3) is equal to (1.1), and g is L$^\natural$-convex. In the case where there is a unique sink in T, i.e., T is a rooted tree, the operations $\overline{\mathrm{mid}}$ and $\underline{\mathrm{mid}}$ are equal, respectively, to $\sqcup$ and $\sqcap$ in the sense of [31], and g is strongly tree submodular. Also notice that alternating L-convex functions correspond to the zigzag orientation.

So different orientations of T define different classes of discrete convex functions. Theory of L-extendable functions captures all these discrete convex functions by the following fact:

(2.4) If $g : T^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ satisfies (2.3), then g is midpoint L-extendable, where its exact L-convex relaxation $\bar{g} : (T^*)^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ is given by

$$\bar{g}(u) := (g(\overline{u}) + g(\underline{u}))/2 \quad (u \in (T^*)^n).$$

We will give the proof of this fact in [20] (since it is bit tedious). In particular the minimization of g over T^n can be solved by the minimization of $\bar{g}$ over $(T^*)^n$. Instead of g, we can apply our results to $\bar{g}$ (and obtain results for original g). This is another reason why we consider alternating L-convex functions and L-extendable functions.

2.4 2-separable convex functions

In this section, we introduce a special class of L-extendable functions, called *2-separable convex functions*. This class is an analogue of a class of functions f on $\mathbf{Z}^n$ represented as the following form:

$$\sum_i f_i(x_i) + \sum_{i,j} g_{ij}(x_i - x_j) + \sum_{i,j} h_{ij}(x_i + x_j) \quad (x \in \mathbf{Z}^n), \tag{2.5}$$

where f_i, g_{ij}, and h_{ij} are 1-dimensional convex functions on $\mathbf{Z}$. Hochbaum [21] considers minimization of functions with this form, and provides a unified framework to NP-hard optimization problems admitting half-integral relaxation and 2-approximation algorithm. Recall (1.2) that a function without terms $h_{ij}(x_i + x_j)$ is a representative example of $\mathrm{L}^\natural$-convex functions. It is known that the half-integral relaxation of (2.5) can be efficiently minimized by a maximum flow algorithm [21]; also see [1, 32].

In this section, we show analogous results: a 2-separable convex function admits an L-convex relaxation each of whose local $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular function is a sum of basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions. Hence this L-convex relaxation can be efficiently minimized by successive applications of max-flow min-cut computations. Moreover, for some special cases, a solution of the L-convex relaxation can be rounded to a 2-approximation solution of the original 2-separable convex function.

We start with the (one-dimensional) convexity on a tree. A function h on $\mathbf{Z}$ is said to be *nondecreasing* if $\Delta h(t) := h(t) - h(t-1) \geq 0$ for $t \in \mathbf{Z}$, an is said to be *convex* if $\Delta^2 h(t) := h(t+1) - 2h(t) + h(t-1) \geq 0$ for $t \in \mathbf{Z}$, and is said to be *even* if $(h(t-1) + h(t+1))/2 = h(t)$ for every odd integer t. We can naturally define convex functions on a tree T. It should be noted that this notion of convexity was considered in the classical literature of facility location analysis [5, 27, 41]. For $u, v \in T$ and an integer t with $0 \leq t \leq d(u, v)$, let $[u, v]_t$ denote the unique vertex s satisfying $d(u, v) = d(u, s) + d(s, v)$ and $t = d(u, s)$. A function h on T is said to be *convex* if for any vertices u, v in T, a function on $\mathbf{Z}$, defined by $t \mapsto h([u, v]_t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq d(u, v)$ (and $t \mapsto +\infty$ otherwise), is convex.

Lemma 2.14. *For a function on T, the convexity, L-convexity, and L-extendability are equivalent. For convex functions f, g on T and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{R}_+$, $\alpha f + \beta g$ is convex, and $\max(f, g)$, defined by $u \mapsto \max\{f(u), g(u)\}$, is convex.*

Let h be a function on $\mathbf{Z}$. For vertices $z, w \in T$, we consider three functions $h_T, h_{T;z}, h_{T;z,w}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} h_T(u, v) &:= h(d(u, v)) \quad (u, v \in T), \\ h_{T;z}(u) &:= h(d(u, z)) \quad (u \in T), \\ h_{T;z,w}(u, v) &:= h(d(u, z) + d(v, w)) \quad (u, v \in T). \end{aligned}$$

We will see below that $h_{T;z}$ is L-convex, and the other two functions are (midpoint) L-extendable; notice that they are not L-convex in general.

Theorem 2.15. *Let h be a non-decreasing convex function on $\mathbf{Z}$, and let z, w be vertices of T.*

(1) *$h_{T;z}$ is convex on T.*

(2) *Suppose that h is even. Then h_T is L-convex. Moreover, for $(u, v) \in T \times T$, function h_T on $\mathcal{F}(u) \times \mathcal{F}(v)$ is a sum of basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions. Namely, for $(s, t) \in \mathcal{F}(u) \times \mathcal{F}(v)$, it holds*

$$h_T(s,t) - h(D) = \begin{cases} \Delta h(1)\delta(s,t) & \text{if } u = v \in W, \\ \Delta h(D)\theta_a(s) & \text{if } u \in W, v \in B, \\ \Delta h(D)\theta_b(t) & \text{if } u \in B, v \in W, \\ \Delta h(D)(\theta_a(s) + \theta_b(t)) + \Delta^2 h(D)\mu_{a,b}(s,t) & \text{if } u, v \in W : u \neq v, \\ 0 & \text{if } u, v \in B. \end{cases}$$

where $D := d(u, v)$, and a and b are vertices in $\mathcal{F}(u)$ and in $\mathcal{F}(v)$ nearest to v and u, respectively.

(3) *Suppose that h is even, and z, w belong to the same color class. Then $h_{T;z,w}$ is L-convex. Moreover, for $(u, v) \in T \times T$, function $h_{T;z,w}$ on $\mathcal{F}(u) \times \mathcal{F}(v)$ is a sum of basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions. Namely, for $(s, t) \in \mathcal{F}(u) \times \mathcal{F}(v)$, it holds*

$$h_{T;z,w}(s,t) - h(D) = \begin{cases} \Delta h(D)\theta_a(s) & \text{if } u \in W, v \in B, \\ \Delta h(D)\theta_b(t) & \text{if } u \in B, v \in W, \\ \Delta h(D)(\theta_a(s) + \theta_b(t)) + \Delta^2 h(D)\mu_{a,b}(s,t) & \text{if } u, v \in W, \\ 0 & \text{if } u, v \in B, \end{cases}$$

where $D := d(u, z) + d(v, w)$, and a and b are vertices in $\mathcal{F}(u)$ and $\mathcal{F}(v)$ nearest to z and w, respectively.

The local expressions of h_T and $h_{T;z,w}$ on $\mathcal{I}(u) \times \mathcal{I}(v)$ are obtained by replacing roles of B and W.

A function ω on T^n is said to be 2-*separable L-convex* if ω is a sum of functions given in Theorem 2.15:

$$\omega(x) := \sum_i f_i(x_i) + \sum_{i,j} g_{ij}(d(x_i, x_j)) + \sum_{i,j} h_{ij}(d(x_i, z_i) + d(x_j, w_j)) \quad (x \in T^n), \tag{2.6}$$

where each f_i is a convex function on T, each g_{ij} and h_{ij} are nondecreasing even convex function on $\mathbf{Z}$, and z_i and w_j are vertices in the same color class. A function ω on B^n is said to be 2-*separable convex* if ω is the form of (2.6) where each g_{ij} and h_{ij} are (not necessarily even) nondecreasing convex functions on $\mathbf{Z}$. A 2-separable convex function on B^n is L-extendable, and its L-convex relaxation $\bar{\omega}$ on T^n is explicitly given by

$$\bar{\omega}(x) := \sum_i f_i(x_i) + \sum_{i,j} \bar{g}_{ij}(d(x_i, x_j)) + \sum_{i,j} \bar{h}_{ij}(d(x_i, z_i) + d(x_j, w_j)) \quad (x \in T^n), \tag{2.7}$$

where $\bar{g}_{ij}$ and $\bar{h}_{ij}$ are even functions obtained from g_{ij} and h_{ij} by replacing $g_{ij}(z)$ and $h_{ij}(z)$ by $(g_{ij}(z-1)+g_{ij}(z+1))/2$ and $(h_{ij}(z-1)+h_{ij}(z+1))/2$, respectively, for each odd integer z. A function ω on T^n is also said be 2-separable convex if ω is the form of (2.6) where each g_{ij} and h_{ij} are (not necessarily even) nondecreasing convex functions on $\mathbf{Z}$. Then ω is midpoint L-extendable.

By Theorem 2.15, the L-convex relaxation $\bar{\omega}$ is locally a sum of basic k-submodular functions. Hence $\bar{\omega}$ is efficiently minimized by successive applications of maximum flow (minimum cut) computations. We will see in Section 3 that 2-separable convex functions arise from minimum cost multiflow problems.

A *convex multifacility location function* is a special 2-separable convex function represented as

$$\omega(x) = \sum_{i,j} f_{ij}(d(x_i, z_j)) + \sum_{i,j} g_{ij}(d(x_i, x_j)) \quad (x \in B^n), \tag{2.8}$$

where f_{ij} and g_{ij} are nonnegative-valued nondecreasing convex functions, and z_j are black vertices. In this case, we take an L-convex relaxation

$$\bar{\omega}(x) = \sum_{i,j} \bar{f}_{ij}(d(x_i, z_j)) + \sum_{i,j} \bar{g}_{ij}(d(x_i, x_j)) \quad (x \in T^n). \tag{2.9}$$

For the case where all terms are linear functions $b_{ij}d(x_i, z_j)$, $c_{ij}d(x_i, x_j)$ with nonnegative coefficients b_{ij}, c_{ij}, the problem of minimizing (2.9) is known as a *multifacility location problem* on a tree; see [27, 41] and also its recent application to computer vision [8, 15], where a faster algorithm in [15] is applicable to the case where only g_{ij} are linear (since our notion of convexity is the same as *T-convexity* in [15] for the case of uniform edge-length).

There is a natural rounding scheme from T^n to B^n. In some cases, we can construct a good approximate solution for ω from a minimizer of $\bar{\omega}$. For $y \in B$ and $x \in T^n$, let $x_{\to y}$ denote the vertex $z \in B^n$ such that for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, $z_i = x_i$ if $x_i \in B$, and z_i is the unique neighbor of x_i close to y (i.e., $d(x_i, y) = 1 + d(z_i, y)$) if $x_i \in W$.

Theorem 2.16. *Let $\omega : B^n \to \mathbf{R}$ be a 2-separable convex function consisting of m terms, and $\bar{\omega} : T^n \to \mathbf{R}$ be its L-convex relaxation.*

(1) *For a given $x \in B^n$, there is an $O(d(\mathrm{opt}(\bar{\omega}), x)\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$ time algorithm to find a global minimizer x^* of $\bar{\omega}$ over T^n, where k is the maximum degree of T.*

(2) *Suppose that ω is a convex multifacility location function. For any $y \in B$, the rounded solution $(x^*)_{\to y}$ is a 2-approximate solution of ω.*

Example 2.17 (Multiway cut)**.** As discussed in [26], multiway cut problem is a representative example of NP-hard problems admitting a k-submodular relaxation (an L-convex relaxation in our sense). Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with a set $S \subseteq V$ of terminals and an edge-capacity $c : E \to \mathbf{R}_+$. Let $V \setminus S = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. A *multiway cut* $\mathcal{X}$ is a partition of V such that each part contains exactly one terminal. The capacity $c(\mathcal{X})$ of $\mathcal{X}$ is the sum of $c(ij)$ over all edges ij whose ends i and j belong to distinct parts in $\mathcal{X}$. The multiway cut problem in G is the problem of finding a multiway cut with minimum capacity.

The multiway cut problem is formulated as minimization of a multifacility location function on a star. Let T be a star with leaf set S and center vertex 0. Suppose that $B = S$ and $W = \{0\}$. Consider the following 2-separable convex function minimization:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Min.} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \le i \le n} \sum_{s \in S : si \in E} c(si) d(s, x_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij \in E : 1 \le i, j \le n} c(ij) d(x_i, x_j), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in B^n. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

This is equivalent to the multiway cut problem on G. To see this, for a multiway cut $\mathcal{X}$, define $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ by: $x_i := s$ if i and s belong to the same part of $\mathcal{X}$. Then the objective of the resulting x is equal to the cut capacity of $\mathcal{X}$. Conversely, for a solution x of (2.10), define

X_s by the set of all vertices i with $x_i = s$ for $s \in S$. Then $\mathcal{X} := \{X_s\}_{s \in S}$ is a multiway cut whose capacity is equal to the objective value of x.

An L-convex relaxation problem relaxes the constraint $x \in B^n$ into $x \in T^n = (B \cup \{0\})^n$. If T^n is identified with ${S_k}^n$, then this is a k-submodular function minimization, where d is equal to δ. An optimum x^* of the relaxed problem can be efficiently obtained by $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-mincut computations for $s \in S$; see Section 3.4.1. Take some $s \in B$. Consider $y := (x^*)_{\to s}$. This 2-approximation is essentially equal to the classical 2-approximation algorithm of multiway cut problem [6]; see [44, Algorithm 4.3].

2.5 Proofs

In this section, we give proofs of results. We will often use the following variation of $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodularity inequality.

Lemma 2.18. *If f is a $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular function on $S_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, then*

$$f(x) + f(y) \geq f(x \wedge y) + \frac{1}{2} f(x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)) + \frac{1}{2} f((x \sqcup y) \sqcup y) \quad (x, y \in S_{\boldsymbol{k}}). \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. Observe that $u \wedge (u \sqcup v)$ is 0 if $0 \neq u \neq v \neq 0$ and is u otherwise $(u, v \in S_k)$. From this we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((x \sqcup y) \wedge x) \sqcup ((x \sqcup y) \wedge y) &= x \sqcup y, \\ ((x \sqcup y) \wedge x) \wedge ((x \sqcup y) \wedge y) &= x \wedge y. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly $u \sqcup (u \sqcup v)$ is v if $u = 0$ and is u otherwise. From this we have

$$(x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)) \sqcup ((x \sqcup y) \sqcup y) = (x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)) \wedge ((x \sqcup y) \sqcup y) = x \sqcup y.$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} &f((x \sqcup y) \wedge x) + f((x \sqcup y) \wedge y) \geq f(x \wedge y) + f(x \sqcup y), \\ &f(x) + f(x \sqcup y) \geq f(x \wedge (x \sqcup y)) + f(x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)), \\ &f(x \sqcup y) + f(y) \geq f((x \sqcup y) \wedge y) + f((x \sqcup y) \sqcup y), \\ &f(x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)) + f((x \sqcup y) \sqcup y) \geq 2f(x \sqcup y). \end{aligned}$$

Adding the first three inequalities and one half of the forth inequality, we obtain (2.11). □

The binary operation $(x, y) \mapsto x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)$ plays important roles in the subsequent arguments. We note the following properties:

(2.12) (1) $x \sqcup (x \sqcup y) \succeq x$.

(2) If y has no zero component, then so does $x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)$.

(3) $(x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)) \sqcup y = x \sqcup y$ and $(x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)) \sqcup (x \sqcup y) = x \sqcup (x \sqcup y)$.

These properties immediately follow from the behavior of each component:

$$u \sqcup (u \sqcup v) = \begin{cases} v & \text{if } u = 0, \\ u & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad (u, v \in S_k).$$

2.5.1 Proof of Theorem 2.6

Let g be an L-convex function on T^n, and let x be a vertex in $\operatorname{dom} g$. We first show the latter part. Suppose (w.l.o.g.) that

$$g(x) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{F}(x)} g(y). \tag{2.13}$$

Let $x = x^0, x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^m$ be a sequence of vertices in generated by the steepest descent algorithm applied to (g, x). Then it holds

$$x = x^0 \succ x^1 \prec x^2 \succ x^3 \prec x^4 \succ \cdots . \tag{2.14}$$

Indeed, $x^0 \succ x^1$ follows from (2.13). Also $x^i \prec x^{i+1} \prec x^{i+2}$ (or $x^i \succ x^{i+1} \succ x^{i+2}$) never occurs. Otherwise $x^{i+2} \in \mathcal{F}(x^i)$ and $g(x^{i+2}) < g(x^{i+1}) < g(x^i)$; this is impossible from the definition of the steepest descent algorithm.

Lemma 2.19. *For $z \in \mathcal{I}(x^k) \cup \mathcal{F}(x^k)$ with $g(z) < g(x^k)$, we have*

$$d(x, z) = k + 1 \quad (k = 1, 2, \ldots).$$

Proof. By (2.14), it holds that $x^{k-1}, x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{F}(x^k)$ if k is odd and $x^{k-1}, x^{k+1} \in \mathcal{I}(x^k)$ if k is even. We use the induction on k. Then we can assume that $d(x^{k-1}, x) = k - 1$ and $d(x^k, x) = k$. Suppose for the moment that k is odd. We are going to show that $d(z, x) = k+1$. By Lemma 2.4, g is $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular on $\mathcal{F}(x^k)$. Notice that both x^{k-1} and z belong to $\mathcal{F}(x^k)$. By Lemma 2.18, we have

$$g(z) + g(x^{k-1}) \geq g(z \wedge x^{k-1}) + \frac{1}{2} g(z \sqcup (z \sqcup x^{k-1})) + \frac{1}{2} g((z \sqcup x^{k-1}) \sqcup x^{k-1}). \tag{2.15}$$

Since x^k is a minimizer of g over $\mathcal{I}(x^{k-1})$, we have

$$g(z \wedge x^{k-1}) \geq g(x^k) > g(z).$$

Hence we necessarily have

$$2g(x^{k-1}) > g(z \sqcup (z \sqcup x^{k-1})) + g((z \sqcup x^{k-1}) \sqcup x^{k-1}). \tag{2.16}$$

This implies $g(x^{k-1}) > g(z \sqcup (z \sqcup x^{k-1}))$ or $g(x^{k-1}) > g((z \sqcup x^{k-1}) \sqcup x^{k-1})$. The second case is impossible. This follows from: $x \preceq (z \sqcup x) \sqcup x$ (see (2.12) (1)) and (2.13) for $k = 1$, and $x^{k-2} \preceq x^{k-1} \preceq (z \sqcup x^{k-1}) \sqcup x^{k-1}$ and $g(x^{k-1}) = \min_{y \in \mathcal{F}(x^{k-2})} g(y)$ for $k > 1$. Thus we have

$$g((z \sqcup x^{k-1}) \sqcup x^{k-1}) \geq g(x^{k-1}) > g(z \sqcup (z \sqcup x^{k-1})). \tag{2.17}$$

Let $z' := x^{k-1} \wedge (z \sqcup (z \sqcup x^{k-1}))$. Then $x^k \preceq z' \preceq x^{k-1}$. By Lemma 2.18, we have

$$g(z \sqcup (z \sqcup x^{k-1})) + g(x^{k-1}) \geq g(z') + \frac{1}{2} g(z \sqcup (z \sqcup x^{k-1})) + \frac{1}{2} g((z \sqcup x^{k-1}) \sqcup x^{k-1}),$$

where we use (2.12) (3) to obtain the second and third terms in the right hand side. By (2.17) we have $g(x^{k-1}) > g(z')$. Notice $z' \in \mathcal{I}(x^{k-1})$. By induction, we have

$$d(x, z') = k. \tag{2.18}$$

Hence we can take an index j with $d(x_j, z'_j) = k$. By $x^k_j \preceq z'_j \preceq x^{k-1}_j$ (in $\mathcal{F}(x^k_j)$), we have $x^k_j = z'_j \prec x^{k-1}_j$ and $d(x_j, x^{k-1}_j) = k - 1$. Since $x^k_j = ((x^{k-1}_j \sqcup z_j) \sqcup z_j) \wedge x^{k-1}_j$, we have $x^{k-1}_j \neq z_j \neq x^k_j$; otherwise $x^{k-1}_j = z_j$ or $x^k_j = z_j$ implies a contradiction $x^{k-1}_j = x^k_j$. Thus x^{k-1}_j and z_j are distinct neighbors of x^k_j in T with $d(x_j, x^{k-1}_j) = k-1$ and $d(x_j, x^k_j) = k$. Since T is a tree, we have $d(x_j, z_j) = k + 1$, and $d(x, z) = k + 1$. The argument for even $k(\geq 2)$ is same; reverse the partial order $\preceq$. □

Let $\mathrm{opt}(g)$ be the set of minimizers of g, and let $m^* := \min_{z\in\mathrm{opt}(g)} d(x,z)$. Since x^m is optimal, we have $m^* \le m$. Our goal is to show $m = m^*$. Let $\tilde{g}$ be a function defined by $\tilde{g}(y) := g(y)$ if $d(x,y) \le m^*$ and $\tilde{g}(y) := \infty$ otherwise. Then $\tilde{g}$ is also L-convex since $d(x,y) \le m^*$ and $d(x,y') \le m^*$ imply $d(x, y\bullet y') \le m^*$ and $d(x, y\circ y') \le m^*$. The subsequence $x = x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^{m^*}$ is also obtained by applying the steepest descent algorithm to $\tilde{g}$ from x. By Lemma 2.19, no vertex z with $d(x,z) > m^*$ is produced. Hence x^{m^*} is necessarily a minimizer of $\tilde{g}$, and is also a minimizer of g. Thus $m = m^*$. This completes the latter part of the proof of Theorem 2.6. The former part is now immediately obtained. Suppose that x does not satisfy (2.13). But x^1 always satisfies $g(x^1) = \min_{y\in\mathcal{F}(x^1)} g(y)$ or $g(x^1) = \min_{y\in\mathcal{I}(x^1)} g(y)$. The sequence $(x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^m)$ is also obtained by the steepest descent algorithm. By the latter claim and the triangle inequality, we have $m - 1 = d(x^1, \mathrm{opt}(g)) \le d(x, \mathrm{opt}(g)) + 1$.

Proposition 2.20. *Let g be an L-convex function on T^n. For $y \in \mathrm{opt}(g)$ and $x \in \mathrm{dom}\, g$ with $g(x) = \min_{y\in\mathcal{F}(x)} g(y)$, there is a sequence $x = x^0, x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^m = y$ such that*

(1) *$m = d(x,y)$,*

(2) *$g(x^i) > g(x^{i+1})$ for $i < d(\mathrm{opt}(g), x)$ and $g(x^i) = g(x^{i+1})$ for $i \ge d(\mathrm{opt}(g), x)$, and*

(3) *$g(x^{i+1}) = \min\{g(z) \mid z \in \mathcal{I}(x^i)\}$ for even i and $g(x^{i+1}) = \min\{g(z) \mid z \in \mathcal{F}(x^i)\}$ for odd i.*

Proof. Take a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. Consider the function g' defined by

$$g'(x) = g(x) + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(x_i, y_i) \quad (x \in T^n).$$

By Theorem 2.15 (that will be proved independently), the second term is L-convex, and hence g' is also L-convex, and has the unique minimizer y. Apply the steepest descent algorithm to (g', x). By Theorem 2.6, we obtain a sequence $x = x^0, x^1, \ldots, x^m = y$ with (1), (2), and (3) for g'. Since ϵ is sufficiently small, any steepest direction x^{i+1} for g' at x^i is also a steepest direction for g. Thus the sequence also satisfies (1),(2), and (3) for g. □

2.5.2 Proof of Theorem 2.10

Let x be a minimizer of an L-convex relaxation g of an L-extendable function h. Take a minimizer $y \in B^n$ of h such that $d(x,y)$ is minimum. We can take a sequence $y = y^0, y^1, y^2, \ldots, y^m = x$ satisfying the conditions in Proposition 2.20, where $m = d(x,y)$. If $m = 1$, then $x \in \mathcal{I}(y)$ ($y \in \mathcal{F}(x)$) and we are done. Suppose (indirectly) $m \ge 2$. Let $z := y^1$ and $w := y^2$. Notice that $y, w \in \mathcal{F}(z)$. Applying Lemma 2.18 to $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular function g on $\mathcal{F}(z)$, we have

$$g(y) + g(w) \ge g(y \wedge w) + \frac{1}{2} g(y \sqcup (y \sqcup w)) + \frac{1}{2} g(w \sqcup (w \sqcup y)).$$

Since y is a maximal element in $\mathcal{F}(z)$ and $y \preceq y \sqcup (y \sqcup w)$, we have $y = y \sqcup (y \sqcup w)$, and $g(y \sqcup (y \sqcup w)) = g(y)$. Also it holds $g(y \wedge w) \ge g(z) \ge g(w)$ (by Proposition 2.20 (3)). This implies

$$g(y) \ge g(w \sqcup (w \sqcup y)).$$

Here $w' := w \sqcup (w \sqcup y)$ is also maximal (in $\mathcal{F}(z)$) and has no zero components (see (2.12) (2)). Thus w' belongs to B^n, and is also a minimizer of h. Since $d(w', w) = 1$ (by $w \preceq w'$) and $d(w, x) = m - 2$, we have $d(x,y) > d(x,w')$. A contradiction to the minimality.

2.5.3 Proof of Theorem 2.9

Let g be an L-convex relaxation of h. Suppose that x is not a minimizer of h. Then x is not a minimizer of g. By the L-optimality criterion (Theorem 2.5), there is $z \in \mathcal{I}(x)$ such that $g(z) < g(x)$. If z is a minimizer of g, then by Theorem 2.10 there is a minimizer $y \in B^n \cap \mathcal{F}(z)$ of h, as required. Suppose that z is not a minimizer of g. There is $w \in \mathcal{F}(z)$ such that $g(w) < g(z)$. By Lemma 2.18 with $x \sqcup (x \sqcup w) = x$, we have

$$g(x) + g(w) \geq g(x \wedge w) + \frac{1}{2}g(x) + \frac{1}{2}g(w \sqcup (w \sqcup x)).$$

Notice $g(w) < g(x \wedge w)$. Hence $g(x) > g(w \sqcup (w \sqcup x))$, and $w \sqcup (w \sqcup x)$ is a required vertex in B^n (by (2.12) (2)).

2.5.4 Proof of Theorem 2.11

We start with preliminary arguments. For a quarter integer $u \in \mathbf{Z}/4$, define half-integers $[u]_1, [u]_{1/2} \in \mathbf{Z}/2$ by

$$[u]_1 := \begin{cases} u & \text{if } u \in \mathbf{Z}/2, \\ \text{the integer nearest to } u & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$[u]_{1/2} := \begin{cases} u & \text{if } u \in \mathbf{Z}/2, \\ \text{the non-integral half-integer nearest to } u & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2.21. *For $u, v \in \mathbf{Z}/4$, we have*

$$\lfloor u - v \rfloor \leq [u]_1 - [v]_1 \leq \lceil u - v \rceil,$$
$$\lfloor u - v \rfloor \leq [u]_{1/2} - [v]_{1/2} \leq \lceil u - v \rceil.$$

Proof. It suffices to consider the cases $([u]_1, [v]_1) = (u \pm 1/4, v)$, $(u, v \pm 1/4)$, $(u + 1/4, v - 1/4)$, or $(u - 1/4, v + 1/4)$. Suppose that the first two cases occur. Then $u - v$ is not a half-integer, and hence $\lfloor u - v \rfloor \leq u - v \pm 1/4 \leq \lceil u - v \rceil$. Consider the last two cases. Then $u \in \mathbf{Z} - 1/4$ and $v \in \mathbf{Z} + 1/4$ or $u \in \mathbf{Z} + 1/4$ and $v \in \mathbf{Z} - 1/4$. Hence $u - v \in \mathbf{Z} + 1/2$. This means that $u - v$ is not an integer but a half-integer. Thus $\lfloor u - v \rfloor \leq u - v \pm 1/2 \leq \lceil u - v \rceil$. The second inequality follows from the same argument. □

Let $x, y \in T^n$. Let P_i denote the unique path connecting x_i and y_i in T. We regard vertices of P_i as integers $0, 1, \ldots, d_i := d(x_i, y_i)$ by the following way. Associate vertex u in P_i with integer $d(x_i, u) \in \{0, 1, \ldots, d_i\}$. Then $x_i = 0$ and $y_i = d_i$. Similarly, let P_i^* denote the unique path connecting x_i and y_i in T^*. Associate the midpoint of each edge uv in P_i with half-integer $(u + v)/2 (= (d(x_i, u) + d(x_i, v))/2)$. Then the vertices of the product $P := P_1 \times P_2 \times \cdots \times P_n$ are integer vectors z with $0 \leq z_i \leq d_i$, and the vertices of $P^* := P_1^* \times P_2^* \times \cdots \times P_n^*$ are half-integer vectors z with $0 \leq z_i \leq d_i$. Under this correspondence, it holds

$$z \bullet z' = [(z + z')/2]_1, \quad z \circ z' = [(z + z')/2]_{1/2} \quad (z, z' \in P^* \subseteq (\mathbf{Z}/2)^n),$$

where $[\cdot]_1$ and $[\cdot]_{1/2}$ are extended on $(\mathbf{Z}/4)^n$ in componentwise.

For $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, let e_i denote the i-th unit vector, and let $\pi_i := e_1 + e_2 + \cdots + e_i$. We can assume that $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \cdots \geq d_n$. Then y is represented as

$$y = x + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d_i - d_{i+1})\pi_i, \tag{2.19}$$

where we let $d_{n+1} = 0$. Let $((x, y))$ and $((x, y))^*$ be the sets of integral points and half-integral points, respectively, in the polytope

$$Q(x, y) := \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n \mid 0 \le z_i - z_{i+1} \le d_i - d_{i+1} \ (1 \le i \le n)\}, \tag{2.20}$$

where we let $z_{n+1} := 0$. Observe that the polytope $Q(x, y)$ is the set of points z represented as

$$z = x + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \pi_i \tag{2.21}$$

for $\alpha_i \in [0, d_i - d_{i+1}]$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$. Note that this representation is unique.

Lemma 2.22. *For $z, z' \in ((x, y))^*$, both $[(z + z')/2]_1$ and $[(z + z')/2]_{1/2}$ belong to $((x, y))^*$.*

Proof. We show that half-integer vectors $[(z + z')/2]_1$ and $[(z + z')/2]_{1/2}$ belong to $Q(x, y)$. By convexity, $w := (z + z')/2 \in (\mathbf{Z}/4)^n$ belong to $Q(x, y)$. Hence

$$0 \le w_i - w_{i+1} \le d_i - d_{i+1}.$$

Notice that $d_i - d_{i+1}$ is integral. By Lemma 2.21, we have

$$0 \le [w_i]_1 - [w_{i+1}]_1 \le d_i - d_{i+1}, \quad 0 \le [w_i]_{1/2} - [w_{i+1}]_{1/2} \le d_i - d_{i+1}.$$

This means that both $[w]_1$ and $[w]_{1/2}$ belong to $Q(x, y)$. □

Let $h : T^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ be an L-extendable function, and let $g : (T^*)^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ be its L-convex relaxation. The discrete midpoint convexity inequality on P^* is given by

$$g(z) + g(z') \ge g([(z + z')/2]_1) + g([(z + z')/2]_{1/2}) \quad (z, z' \in P^*). \tag{2.22}$$

In particular, for $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, we have

$$g(\pi_j/2) + g(\pi_i/2 + \pi_j) \ge g(\pi_j) + g(\pi_i/2 + \pi_j/2), \tag{2.23}$$

$$g(0) + g(\pi_i/2 + \pi_j/2) \ge g(\pi_i/2) + g(\pi_j/2), \tag{2.24}$$

$$g(\pi_i/2 + \pi_j/2) + g(\pi_i + \pi_j) \ge g(\pi_i + \pi_j/2) + g(\pi_i/2 + \pi_j), \tag{2.25}$$

$$g(\pi_i/2) + g(\pi_i + \pi_j/2) \ge g(\pi_i/2 + \pi_j/2) + g(\pi_i). \tag{2.26}$$

For example, $(\pi_i + 3\pi_j)/4 = \pi_i + 3(e_{i+1} + e_{i+2} + \cdots + e_j)/4$ for $i < j$ and $(\pi_i + 3\pi_j)/4 = \pi_j + (e_{j+1} + e_{j+2} + \cdots + e_i)/4$ for $i > j$. Thus $[(\pi_i + 3\pi_j)/4]_1 = \pi_j$ and $[(\pi_i + 3\pi_j)/4]_{1/2} = \pi_i/2 + \pi_j/2$. From (2.22), we see the first equality. The remaining are obtained in the same way.

Lemma 2.23. *For $x, y \in \operatorname{dom} h$, it holds $((x, y)) \subseteq \operatorname{dom} h$.*

Proof. We use the induction on $d(x, y) = k$. We can assume that $\operatorname{dom} h$ belongs to $((x, y))$. Indeed, modify g and h so that they take ∞ on points not belonging to $Q(x, y)$. By Lemma 2.22, g is still L-convex, and hence is an L-convex relaxation of h. In particular h is L-extendable. We may assume that one of x, y, say x, is not a minimizer of h (by adding a 2-separable L-convex function $z \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{n} d(z_i, y_i)$ to h, g if necessarily).

Use expression (2.19) to represent x, y. By induction it suffices to show that each π_i with $d_i > d_{i+1}$ belongs to $\operatorname{dom} h$, since $d(\pi_i, y) = k - 1$ and $y = \pi_i + (d_i - d_{i+1} - 1)\pi_i + \sum_{j \ne i}(d_j - d_{j+1})\pi_j$. By Theorem 2.9 with expression (2.21), there is j such that $d_j > d_{j+1}$ and $h(x) = h(0) > h(\pi_j) < \infty$. Consider an index $i \ne j$ with $d_i > d_{i+1}$. We show that $\pi_i \in \operatorname{dom} h$. By induction for (π_j, y), we have $\pi_i + \pi_j \in \operatorname{dom} h \subseteq \operatorname{dom} g$. By applying the midpoint convexity (2.22) for g at $(0, \pi_j)$ and at $(\pi_j, \pi_i + \pi_j)$, we have $\pi_j/2, \pi_j + \pi_i/2 \in \operatorname{dom} g$. By (2.23), we have $\pi_i/2 + \pi_j/2 \in \operatorname{dom} g$. Similarly, by (2.24), we have $\pi_i/2 \in \operatorname{dom} g$. By (2.25) we have $\pi_i + \pi_j/2 \in \operatorname{dom} g$. Finally, by (2.26), we have $\pi_i \in \operatorname{dom} h$, as required. □

The essence of the proximity theorem is the following, where this lemma may be viewed as an analogue of [10, (20.37)].

Lemma 2.24. *For $x \in \operatorname{dom} h$ and a minimizer y of h with $d(x, \operatorname{opt}(h)) = d(x, y)$, we have*

$$h(x) > g(x + \pi_i/2) > h(x + \pi_i) \quad (i : d_i - d_{i+1} \geq 2).$$

Proof. As above, we can assume that $\operatorname{dom} h$ belongs to $((x, y))$, and $\operatorname{dom} h = ((x, y))$ (by Lemma 2.23). Then y is a unique minimizer of h over $((x, y))$. We use the induction on $d(x, y)$. Consider first the case where $y = x+(d_i-d_{i+1})\pi_i$ for some i with $d_i-d_{i+1} \geq 2$. By Theorem 2.9 with induction, we have $h(0) > h(\pi_i) > h(2\pi_i)$. By $h(0) + h(\pi_i) = g(0) + g(\pi_i) \geq 2g(\pi_i/2)$ we have $h(0) > g(\pi_i/2)$. By $h(\pi_i)+h(2\pi_i) = g(\pi_i)+g(2\pi_i) \geq 2g(3\pi_i/2)$, we have $g(\pi_i) > g(3\pi_i/2)$. By $g(\pi_i/2)+g(3\pi_i/2) \geq 2g(\pi_i)$, we have $g(\pi_i/2) > g(\pi_i) = h(\pi_i)$. Thus $h(0) > g(\pi_i/2) > h(\pi_i)$ holds.

Consider the general case. Take i with $d_i - d_{i+1} \geq 2$. We may assume that there is $j \neq i$ with $d_j - d_{j+1} \geq 1$. By induction for (π_j, y), we have

$$g(\pi_j) = h(\pi_j) > g(\pi_j + \pi_i/2) > g(\pi_i + \pi_j) = h(\pi_i + \pi_j). \tag{2.27}$$

By (2.27) and (2.23), we have $g(\pi_j/2) > g(\pi_i/2 + \pi_j/2)$, and, by (2.24), $g(0) > g(\pi_i/2)$. Similarly, by (2.27) and (2.25), we have $g(\pi_i/2 + \pi_j/2) > g(\pi_i + \pi_j/2)$, and, by (2.26), $g(\pi_i/2) > g(\pi_i)$. Thus we have $h(0) = g(0) > g(\pi_i/2) > g(\pi_i) = h(\pi_i)$, as required. □

We are ready to prove Theorem 2.11. Let h be a midpoint L-extendable function on T^n, and let x be a minimizer of h over B^n. Let y be a minimizer of h over T^n with $d(x, \operatorname{opt}(h)) = d(x, y)$. We can assume that $h(y) < h(x)$. Consider $((x, y))$ as above. Since x is a minimizer of h over B^n, we have $h(x) \leq h(x + \alpha\pi_i)$ for an even integer α. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.24, we have $h(x) > h(x + \alpha\pi_i)$ for $\alpha \in 1, 2, \ldots, d_i - d_{i+1} - 1$ if $d_i - d_{i+1} \geq 2$. This means that $d_i - d_{i+1} \geq 3$ is impossible. Thus $d_i - d_{i+1} \leq 2$ for each i. Hence $d(x, y) \leq 2n$.

Consider the case where h admits as an exact L-convex relaxation. In the proof of Lemma 2.24, we can assume that y is also a unique minimizer of g (by perturbing h, g if necessarily). Consequently the statement of Lemma 2.24 holds for index i with $d_i - d_{i+1} \geq 1$. Therefore, in the above argument, $d_i - d_{i+1} \geq 2$ is impossible. Thus we obtain the latter statement of Theorem 2.11.

2.5.5 Proof of Lemma 2.14

It suffices to consider the case where T is a path. Hence T is naturally identified with $\mathbf{Z}$, and $B = 2\mathbf{Z}$. Suppose that f is convex on $\mathbf{Z}$. Then it is easy to see that $f(u) + f(v) \geq f(\lfloor (u + v)/2 \rfloor) + f(\lceil (u+v)/2 \rceil) = f(u \circ v) + f(u \bullet v)$. Thus f is (alternating) L-convex. The converse is also easy. If $f : \mathbf{Z} \to \mathbf{R}$ is convex, then $\bar{f} : \mathbf{Z}/2 \to \mathbf{R}$ defined by $u \mapsto (f(\lfloor u \rfloor) + f(\lceil u \rceil))/2$ is also convex (and L-convex) on T^*, and f is L-extendable. The converse is also easy: the restriction of convex function on $\mathbf{Z}/2$ to $\mathbf{Z}$ is also convex on $\mathbf{Z}$. The latter part is straightforward to be verified.

2.5.6 Proof of Theorem 2.15

We begin with preliminary arguments on the convexity of a tree. Let $\bar{T}$ be the set of all formal combinations of vertices of form $\lambda u+\mu v$, where uv is an edge, and λ and μ are nonnegative reals with $\lambda+\mu = 1$. Informally speaking, $\bar{T}$ is a "tree" obtained by filling the "unit segment" to each edge. We can naturally regard T and T^* as subsets of $\bar{T}$ (by $T^* \ni w_{uv} \mapsto (1/2)u+(1/2)v$). Also the metric d on T is extended to $\bar{T}$ as follows. For two points $p = \lambda u+\mu v$, $p' = \lambda' u'+\mu' v' \in \bar{T}$, if $(u, v) = (u', v')$, then $d(p, p') := |\lambda - \lambda'| = |\mu - \mu'|$. Otherwise we can assume that $d(v, v') = d(v, u) + d(u, u') + d(u', v')$. Define $d(p, p') := \mu + d(u, u') + \mu'$.

For points $p, q \in \bar{T}$ and $t \in [0,1]$, there is a unique point r, denoted by $p \circ_t q$, such that $d(p,q) = d(p,r) + d(r,q)$, $d(p,r) := td(p,q)$, and $d(r,q) := (1-t)d(p,q)$. Consider the Cartesian product $\bar{T}^n$. For $x, y \in \bar{T}^n$, define $x \circ_t y := (x_1 \circ_t y_1, x_2 \circ_t y_2, \ldots, x_n \circ_t y_n)$. A function f on $\bar{T}^n$ is said to be *convex* if it satisfies

$$(1-t)f(x) + tf(y) \geq f(x \circ_t y) \quad (t \in [0,1], x, y \in \bar{T}^n).$$

In the case where T is a path of infinite length, $\bar{T}$ is isometric to $\mathbf{R}$, and this convexity coincides with the ordinary Euclidean convexity. An old theorem in location theory, due to Dearing, Francis, and Lowe [5], says that the distance function d is convex on $\bar{T}^2$.

Lemma 2.25 ([5])**.** *d is convex on $\bar{T}^2$.*

We note local expressions of functions $(s,t) \mapsto h(d(s,t))$ and $(s,t) \mapsto h(d(s,a) + d(t,b))$.

Lemma 2.26. *Let h be an even function on $\mathbf{Z}$ and let $u, v \in W$.*

(1) *For $s, t \in \mathcal{F}(u)$, we have*

$$h(0) + \Delta h(1)\delta(s,t) = h(d(s,t)).$$

(2) *For $s, a \in \mathcal{F}(u)$, we have*

$$h(1) + \Delta h(1)\theta_a(s) = \begin{cases} h(d(s,a)) & \text{if } a \neq u, \\ h(d(s,a)+1) & \text{if } a = u. \end{cases}$$

(3) *For $(s,t), (a,b) \in \mathcal{F}(u) \times \mathcal{F}(v)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &h(2) + \Delta h(2)(\theta_a(s) + \theta_b(t)) + \Delta^2 h(2)\mu_{a,b}(s,t) \\ &= \begin{cases} h(d(s,a) + d(t,b) + 2) & \text{if } (a,b) = (u,v), \\ h(d(s,a) + d(t,b) + 1) & \text{if } a = u, b \neq v \text{ or } a \neq u, b = v, \\ h(d(s,a) + d(t,b)) & \text{if } a \neq u, b \neq v. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (1). Observe $d(s,t) = \delta(s,t)$. Thus $d(s,t) = 0$ implies $h(0) + \Delta h(1) \cdot 0 = h(0)$. Also $d(s,t) = 1$ implies $h(0) + \Delta h(1) \cdot 1 = h(1)$, and $d(s,t) = 2$ implies that $h(0) + \Delta h(1) \cdot 2 = 2h(1) - h(0) = h(2)$ (by the evenness of h).

(2). Consider the case where the right hand side is equal to $h(2)$. Then $a \neq s \neq u$ must hold. Therefore the left hand side is $h(1) + \Delta h(1) \cdot 1 = h(2)$. Suppose that the right hand side is equal to $h(1)$. Then $s = u$ holds. Therefore the left hand side is $h(1) + \Delta h(1) \cdot 0 = h(1)$. Suppose that the right hand side is equal to $h(0)$. Then $s = a \neq u$ holds. Therefore the left hand side is $h(1) + \Delta h(1) \cdot (-1) = h(0)$.

(3). Consider the case where the right hand side is equal to $h(4)$. Then $u \neq s \neq a$ and $v \neq t \neq b$ must hold. The left hand side is equal to $h(2) + \Delta h(2) \cdot 2 + \Delta^2 h(2) \cdot 2 = -h(2) + 2h(3) = h(4)$. Consider the case where the right hand side is equal to $h(3)$. Then $u \neq s \neq a$ and $v = t$ or $u = s$ and $v \neq t \neq b$ must hold. The left hand side is equal to $h(2) + \Delta h(2) \cdot 1 + \Delta^2 h(2) \cdot 1 = h(3)$.

Consider the case where the right hand side is equal to $h(2)$. Then $s = u$ and $t = v$ must hold. The left hand side is equal to to $h(2) + \Delta h(2) \cdot 0 + \Delta^2 h(2) \cdot 0 = h(2)$.

Consider the case where the right hand side is equal to $h(1)$. Then $s = a = u$ and $t = b \neq v$, $s = a \neq u$ and $t = b = v$, $s = a \neq u$ and $b \neq t = v$, or $a \neq s = u$ and $t = b \neq v$. The left hand side is equal to $h(2) + \Delta h(2) \cdot (-1) + \Delta^2 h(2) \cdot 0 = h(1)$.

Consider the case where the right hand side is equal to $h(0)$. Then $s = a \neq u$ and $t = b \neq v$. The left hand side is equal to $h(2) + \Delta h(2) \cdot (-2) + \Delta^2 h(2) \cdot 0 = -h(2) + 2h(1) = h(0)$. □

Proof of (1). Take any vertex x of T and its two distinct neighbors y, y'. It suffices to show $h(d(y,z)) + h(d(y',z)) \geq 2h(d(x,z))$. Observe that $\{d(y,z), d(y',z)\} = \{d(x,z)+1, d(x,z)-1\}$ or $d(y,z) = d(y',z) = d(x,z)+1$ holds. For the first case, $h(d(y,z)) + h(d(y',z)) = h(d(x,z)+1) + h(d(x,z)-1) \geq 2h(d(x,z))$ by the convexity of h. For the second case, $h(d(y,z)) + h(d(y',z)) \geq h(d(x,z)) + h(d(x,z)) = 2h(d(x,z))$ by the monotonicity of h.

Proof of (2). Extend $h : \mathbf{Z} \to \mathbf{R}$ to $\mathbf{Z}/2 \to \mathbf{R}$ by $h(z) := h(z)$ if $z \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $h(z) := (h(z-1/2) + h(z+1/2))/2$ otherwise. Take $(u,v), (u',v') \in T^2$. We are going to show the discrete midpoint convexity for h_T:

$$h(d(u,v)) + h(d(u',v')) \geq h(d(u \circ u', v \circ v')) + h(d(u \bullet u', v \bullet v')).$$

Since h is convex, we have

$$h(d(u,v)) + h(d(u',v')) \geq 2h\left(\frac{d(u,v) + d(u',v')}{2}\right).$$

By Lemma 2.25, we have $d(u,v) + d(u',v') \geq 2d(u \circ_{1/2} u', v \circ_{1/2} v')$. Since h is nondecreasing, we have

$$2h\left(\frac{d(u,v) + d(u',v')}{2}\right) \geq 2h(d(u \circ_{1/2} u', v \circ_{1/2} v')).$$

Claim 2.27. $2h(d(u \circ_{1/2} u', v \circ_{1/2} v')) = h(d(u \circ u', v \circ v')) + h(d(u \bullet u', v \bullet v'))$.

Proof. Let $\bar{u} := u \circ_{1/2} u'$ and $\bar{v} := v \circ_{1/2} v'$. The claim is obvious when $\bar{u} = \bar{v}$ or both $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ belong to T. So we consider the other cases.

Case 1: $\bar{u} \in T$ and $\bar{v} \notin T$. Then $d(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ is a half-integer, and hence we have

$$2h(d(\bar{u}, \bar{v})) = h(d(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) - 1/2) + h(d(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) + 1/2).$$

Since $\bar{u} \in T$, we have $\bar{u} = u \circ u' = u \bullet u'$, and

$$\{d(\bar{u}, v \circ v'), d(\bar{u}, v \bullet v')\} = \{d(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) - 1/2, d(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) + 1/2\}.$$

Hence we have the claim.

Case 2: $\bar{u} \notin T$ and $\bar{v} \notin T$. We can take edges ss' and tt' of T such that $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ are the midpoints of ss' and tt', respectively. In particular, $d(\bar{u}, s) = d(t, \bar{v}) = d(\bar{u}, s') = d(t', \bar{v}) = 1/2$. We can assume that

$$d(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = d(\bar{u}, s) + d(s,t) + d(t, \bar{v}).$$

Then $d(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = d(s', t) = d(s, t')$, and $d(s', t') = d(s,t) + 2$. Suppose that $d(s,t)$ is odd. Then s and t belong to different color classes; so $(s',t) = (u \circ u', v \circ v')$ and $(s,t') = (u \bullet u', v \bullet v')$ or $(s,t') = (u \circ u', v \circ v')$ and $(s',t) = (u \bullet u', v \bullet v')$. Thus $d(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = d(u \circ u', v \circ v') = d(u \bullet u', v \bullet v')$, and the claim is true. Suppose that $d(s,t)$ is even. Then $(s,t) = (u \circ u', v \circ v')$ and $(s',t') = (u \bullet u', v \bullet v')$ or $(s',t') = (u \circ u', v \circ v')$ and $(s,t) = (u \bullet u', v \bullet v')$. Thus we have

$$\{d(u \circ u', v \circ v'), d(u \bullet u', v \bullet v')\} = \{d(s,t), d(s,t) + 2\}.$$

By $d(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = d(s,t) + 1$ that is odd, we have

$$2h(d(\bar{u}, \bar{v})) = h(d(s,t)) + h(d(s,t) + 2).$$

Thus we have the claim. □

Therefore h_T is L-convex. We verify the latter part of (2). For the case for $u = v \in W$, we obtain the formula from Lemma 2.26 (1). For other cases, we have

$$h(d(s,t)) = h(d(s,a) + d(a,b) + d(b,t)). \tag{2.28}$$

If $u \in W, v \in B$, then $t = b = v$, and $d(a,b) = D-1$ is even. By Lemma 2.26 (2), we obtain $h_T(s,t) = h(d(s,a)+D-1) = h(D)+\Delta h(D)\theta_a(s)$. The argument for the case $u \in B, v \in W$ is the same. Suppose that $u, v \in W$ with $u \neq v$. Then $d(s,a)+d(t,b)+D-2$, and $d(a,b) = D-2$ is even. By Lemma 2.26 (3) applied to $h_T(s,t) = h(d(s,a) + d(t,b) + D - 2)$, we obtain the required formula.

Proof of (3). We show the discrete midpoint convexity for $h_{T;z,w}$. Take vertices $u, v, u', v' \in T$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&h(d(u,z) + d(v,w)) + h(d(u',z) + d(v',w)) \\
&\geq 2h\left(\frac{d(u,z) + d(v,w) + d(u',z) + d(v',w)}{2}\right) \\
&\geq 2h(d(u \circ_{1/2} u', z) + d(v \circ_{1/2} v', w)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use convexity of h in the first inequality, and use the monotonicity and Lemma 2.25 in the second.

Claim 2.28. $2h(d(u \circ_{1/2} u', z) + d(v \circ_{1/2} v', w)) = h_{T;z,w}(u \bullet u', v \bullet v') + h_{T;z,w}(u \circ u', v \circ v')$.

Proof. Let $\bar{u} := u \circ_{1/2} u'$ and $\bar{v} := v \circ_{1/2} v'$.

Case 1: $\bar{u} \in T$ and $\bar{v} \in T$. In this case, $\bar{u} = u \bullet u' = u \circ u'$ and $\bar{v} = v \bullet v' = v \circ v'$ hold, and hence the claim holds.

Case 2: $\bar{u} \notin T$ and $\bar{v} \in T$. In this case, there is an edge st of T such that $\bar{u}$ is the midpoint of st. We can assume that $d(z,s) = d(z,t) + 1$ and $d(z,\bar{u}) = d(z,t) + 1/2$. Since $d(\bar{u},z) + d(\bar{v},w)$ is not an integer, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
2h(d(\bar{u},z) + d(\bar{v},w)) &= h(d(\bar{u},z) + d(\bar{v},w) + 1/2) + h(d(\bar{u},z) + d(\bar{v},w) - 1/2) \\
&= h(d(s,z) + d(\bar{v},w)) + h(d(t,z) + d(\bar{v},w)).
\end{aligned}$$

Then the claim follows from $\bar{v} = v \bullet v' = v \circ v'$, and $\{u \bullet u', u \circ u'\} = \{s,t\}$.

Case 3: $\bar{u} \notin T$ and $\bar{v} \notin T$. Let ab denote the edge such that $\bar{u}$ is the midpoint of ab, and let st denote the edge such that $\bar{v}$ is the midpoint of st. We can assume that $(a,b) = (u \bullet u', u \circ u')$ and $(s,t) = (v \bullet v', v \circ v')$.

Case 3.1: $d(a,z) - d(b,z) = d(s,w) - d(t,w) \in \{-1,1\}$. Since z, w have the same color and a, s have the same color, $d(\bar{u},z) + d(\bar{v},w) = d(a,z) + d(s,w) \pm 1$ must be odd. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
2h(d(\bar{u},z) + d(\bar{v},w)) &= h(d(\bar{u},z) + d(\bar{v},w) - 1) + h(d(\bar{u},z) + d(\bar{v},w) + 1) \\
&= h(d(a,z) + d(s,w)) + h(d(b,z) + d(t,w))
\end{aligned}$$

as required.

Case 3.2: $d(a,z) - d(b,z) \neq d(s,w) - d(t,w)$. In this case, $d(\bar{u},z) + d(\bar{v},w) = d(a,z) + d(s,w) = d(b,z) + d(t,w)$, and hence we have the claim. □

We show the latter part of (3). It holds that $d(s,z) + d(t,w) = d(s,a) + d(t,b) + d(a,z) + d(b,w)$. Suppose that $u \in W, v \in B$. Then $\mathcal{F}(v) = \{v\}$, $b = v = t$, and D is odd. Suppose that $z \neq u$. Then $a \neq u$, and $d(s,z) + d(t,w) = d(s,a) + D - 1$. Thus by Lemma 2.26 (2), we have $h_{T;z,w}(s,t) = h(d(s,a) + D - 1) = h(D) + \Delta h(D)\theta_a(s)$. Suppose that $z = u$.

Then $a = u$, and $d(s,z) + d(t,w) = d(s,a) + 1 + (D-1)$. By Lemma 2.26 (2), we have $h_{T;z,w}(s,t) = h(d(s,a) + 1 + D - 1) = h(D) + \Delta h(D)\theta_a(s)$. The argument for $u \in B, v \in W$ is similar.

Suppose that $u, v \in W$. If $u \neq z$ and $v \neq w$, then $a \neq u$ and $b \neq v$. Also $d(s,z) + d(t,w) = d(s,a) + d(t,b) + D - 2$, and D is even. Apply Lemma 2.26 (3) to $h_{T;z,w}(s,t) = h(d(s,a) + d(t,b) + D - 2)$, we obtain the formula.

If $u = z$ and $v \neq w$ or $u \neq z$ and $v = w$, then $u = a$ and $v \neq b$ or $u \neq a$ and $v = b$, and we have $d(s,z) + d(t,w) = d(s,a) + d(t,b) + D - 1$ with D even. By Lemma 2.26 (2) to $h_{T;z,w}(s,t) = h(d(s,a) + d(t,b) + 1 + (D-2))$, we obtain the formula. If $u = z$ and $v = w$, then $u = a$, $v = b$, and $d(s,z) + d(t,w) = d(s,a) + d(t,b)$ with $D = 0$. By Lemma 2.26 (2) to $h_{T;z,w}(s,t) = h(d(s,a) + d(t,b))$, we obtain the formula.

2.5.7 Proof of Theorem 2.16

(1). By Theorem 2.15, all functions $h_T, h_{T,z}, h_{T,z,w}$ are locally basic k-submodular. Hence, by Theorem 2.2, the minimization of $\bar{\omega}$ over $\mathcal{I}(x)$ and $\mathcal{F}(x)$ can be done in $O(\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$ time. By Theorem 2.6, the steepest descent algorithm for ω with initial point $x \in B^n$ iterates $d(\mathrm{opt}(\bar{\omega}), x)$ steps to obtain an optimal solution x^* of $\bar{\omega}$. Hence the total time is $O(d(\mathrm{opt}(\bar{\omega}), x)\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$.

(2). Let $u := (x^*)_{\to y}$. It suffices to show

$$f_{ij}(d(u_i, z_j)) \leq 2\bar{f}_{ij}(x^*_i, z_j), \quad g_{ij}(d(u_i, u_j)) \leq 2\bar{g}_{ij}(x^*_i, x^*_j)$$

for each i, j.

We may suppose that $x^*_i \neq u_i$. Namely x^*_i is a white vertex, and $d(x^*_i, z_j)$ is odd. Thus $\bar{f}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, z_j)) = \{f_{ij}(d(x^*_i, z_j) - 1) + f_{ij}(d(x^*_i, z_j) + 1)\}/2$. If $d(u_i, z_j) = d(x^*_i, z_j) - 1$, then by monotonicity and nonnegativity we have $\bar{f}_{ij}(d(u_i, z_j)) \leq \bar{f}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, z_j)) \leq 2\bar{f}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, z_j))$. If $d(u_i, z_j) = d(x^*_i, z_j) + 1$, then by nonnegativity we have

$$f_{ij}(d(u_i, z_j)) = 2\bar{f}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, z_j)) - f_{ij}(d(x^*_i, z_j) - 1) \leq 2\bar{f}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, z_j)).$$

Next consider $\bar{g}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, x^*_j))$. Suppose that x^*_j is black. Then $x^*_j = u_j$ and $d(x^*_i, x^*_j)$ is odd. Thus $\bar{g}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, x^*_j)) = \{g_{ij}(d(x^*_i, x^*_j) - 1) + g_{ij}(d(x^*_i, x^*_j) + 1)\}/2$. By the same argument above, we have $g_{ij}(d(u_i, u_j)) \leq 2\bar{g}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, x^*_j))$. Suppose that x^*_j is also white; $d(x^*_i, x^*_j)$ is even. If the unique path between x^*_i and y contains x^*_j, then $d(x^*_i, x^*_j) = d(u_i, u_j)$, and $g_{ij}(d(u_i, u_j)) = \bar{g}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, x^*_j)) \leq 2\bar{g}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, x^*_j))$. The same holds for the case where the unique path between x^*_j and y contains x^*_i. Suppose not. There is a vertex m in the path between x^*_i and x^*_j such that m belongs to the path between y and x^*_i and the path between y and x^*_j. Therefore the rounded u_i and u_j are closer to m. Hence $d(u_i, u_j) \leq d(x^*_i, x^*_j)$, and by monotonicity we have $g_{ij}(d(u_i, u_j)) \leq \bar{g}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, x^*_j)) \leq 2\bar{g}_{ij}(d(x^*_i, x^*_j))$.

3 Minimum cost multiflow

In this section, as an application of the results in the previous section, we provide a new simple combinatorial (weakly) polynomial time algorithm to solve minimum cost maximum free multiflow problem. The design of such an algorithm was the original motivation of developing the theory of L-extendable functions.

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be an undirected network on node set V, edge set E, terminal set $S \subseteq V$, and edge-capacity $c : E \to \mathbf{Z}_+$. An *S-path* in $\mathcal{N}$ is a path connecting distinct terminals in S. A *multiflow* f is a pair $(\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ of a (multi-)set $\mathcal{P}$ of S-paths and a nonnegative-valued function $\lambda : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbf{R}_+$ satisfying the capacity constraint:

$$f(e) := \sum\{\lambda(P) \mid P \in \mathcal{P}\colon\ P \text{ contains } e\ \} \leq c(e) \quad (e \in E). \tag{3.1}$$

If 2λ is integer-valued, then f is called *half-integral*. For distinct terminals $s, t \in S$, let $f(s,t)$ denote the total value of the (s,t)-flow in f, i.e.,

$$f(s,t) := \sum \{\lambda(P) \mid P \in \mathcal{P}\colon\ P \text{ is an } (s,t)\text{-path } \}.$$

Let $f(s)$ denote the total value on flows connecting s, i.e., $f(s) := \sum_{t \in S \setminus \{s\}} f(s,t)$. Then the total flow-value v_f is defined by

$$v_f := \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \lambda(P) = \sum_{s,t \in S : s \neq t} f(s,t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in S} f(s).$$

The *maximum free multiflow problem* (MF) is:

(MF) Find a multiflow f having the maximum total flow value v_f.

A *maximum free multiflow* is a multiflow having the maximum total flow-value.

Observe that $f(s)$ is the total flow value of the $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-flow in f, and hence is at most the minimum value κ_s of an $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-cut. Thus the total flow-value of any multiflow is at most $\sum_{s \in S} \kappa_s / 2$. A classical theorem by Lovász [34] and Cherkassky [4] says that this bound is always attained by a half-integral multiflow.

Theorem 3.1 ([4, 34]). *The maximum flow-value of a free multiflow is equal to*

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in S} \kappa_s,$$

and there exists a half-integral maximum free multiflow.

Karzanov [28] considered a minimum cost version of (MF). Now the network $\mathcal{N}$ has a nonnegative edge-cost $a : E \to \mathbf{Z}_+$. The total *cost* a_f of multiflow f is defined by $a_f := \sum_{e \in E} a(e) f(e)$. The *minimum cost maximum free multiflow problem* is:

(MCMF) Find a maximum free multiflow having the minimum total cost.

There are two approaches to solve this problem. The first one is based on the following auxiliary maximum multiflow problem with a positive parameter $\mu > 0$:

(M) Find a multiflow f maximizing $\mu v_f - a_f$.

If μ is sufficiently large, then an optimal multiflow in (M) is a minimum cost maximum free multiflow. Karzanov [28] showed the half-integrality of (M).

Theorem 3.2 ([28]). *For any $\mu \geq 0$, there exists a half-integral optimal multiflow in (M).*

In particular there always exists a half-integral minimum cost free multiflow. The previous algorithms [14, 28, 29] are based on this formulation.

The second approach, which we will mainly deal with, is based on a node-demand multiflow formulation. We are further given a nonnegative *demand* $r : S \to \mathbf{Z}_+$ on terminal set S. A multiflow f is said to be *feasible* (to r) if $f(s) \geq r(s)$ for $s \in S$. The *minimum cost feasible free multiflow problem* (N) is:

(N) Find a feasible multiflow having the minimum total cost.

This problem (N) can solve (MCMF). Indeed, for each $s \in S$, add new non-terminal node $\bar{s}$ and new edge $s\bar{s}$ with capacity κ_s and zero cost, and replace each edge is by $i\bar{s}$. Let $r(s) := \kappa_s$ for $s \in S$. Any feasible multiflow f for the new network must satisfy $f(s) = r(s) = \kappa_s$. After contracting edges $s\bar{s}$, the resulting f is necessarily a maximum free multiflow in the original network. Also all maximum free multiflows are obtained in this way. Indeed, by Theorem 3.1, a maximum free multiflow is simultaneously a maximum single commodity $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-flow for $s \in S$. Hence $f(s) = \kappa_s$ must hold, and f is extended to a feasible multiflow in the new network.

The problem (N) itself seems natural and fundamental, but has not been well-studied so far. Also we do not know whether (N) reduces to (M), and whether (M) reduces to (N). Recently Fukunaga [9] addressed the problem (N) in connection with a class of network design problems, called (generalized) *terminal backup problems* [2, 3, 43]. As was noted by him, the problem (N) is also formulated as the following cut-covering linear program.

$$\begin{aligned} \textbf{(L)} \quad \text{Min.} \quad & \sum_{e \in E} a(e)x(e) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta X) \geq r(s) \quad (s \in S, X \in \mathcal{C}_s), \\ & 0 \leq x(e) \leq c(e) \quad (e \in E), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_s$ denotes the set of node subsets $X \subseteq V$ such that X contains s and does not contain other terminals. The problems (N) and (L) are equivalent in the following sense.

Lemma 3.3 (see [9]). (1) *For an optimal solution f of (N), the flow-support $x : E \to \mathbf{R}_+$ defined by $x(e) := f(e)$ $(e \in E)$ is an optimal solution of (L).*

(2) *For an optimal solution $x : E \to \mathbf{R}_+$ of (L), a feasible multiflow f in $\mathcal{N}$ with the capacity x exists, and is optimal to (N).*

In particular the optimal values of the two problems are the same.

Proof. A feasible multiflow f contains an $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-flow with the total flow-value at least $r(s)$. The capacity of any $(s, S\setminus\{s\})$-cut under capacity x is at least $r(s)$ for $s \in S$. This means that x is feasible to (L). Hence the optimal value of (L) is at least that of (N). Conversely, for a feasible solution x of (L), consider a maximum free multiflow f under capacity x. By Theorem 3.1, $f(s)$ is equal to the minimum capacity of an $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-cut under capacity x, which is at least $r(s)$. Thus f is feasible, and $a_f \leq \sum_{e \in E} a(e)x(e)$. This means that the optimal value of (N) is at least that of (L). □

Notice that a feasible multiflow exists (or (L) is feasible) if and only if

$$c(\delta X) \geq r(s) \quad (s \in S, X \in \mathcal{C}_s). \tag{3.2}$$

We will assume this condition in the sequel. Fukunaga [9] proved the half-integrality for (N) and (L).

Theorem 3.4 ([9]). *There exist half-integral optimal solutions in (N) and in (L). They can be obtained in strongly polynomial time.*

The polynomial time solvability depends on a generic LP-solver for solving (L); observe that the separation of the feasible region of (L) is done by minimum cut computations, and thus (L) is solved by the ellipsoid method. Also (L) has an extended formulation of polynomial size [1], and thus is solved by the interior point method.

As an application of results in the previous section, we present a purely combinatorial polynomial time scaling algorithm to obtain half-integral optimal solutions in (N), in (L), and in (MCMF). The main result in this section is as follows:

[1] Instead of exponentially many conditions $x(\delta X) \geq r(s)$, consider a single commodity $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-flow φ_s under capacity x with total flow value at least $r(s)$.

Theorem 3.5. *There exists an $O(n \log(nAC)\, \mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$ time algorithm to solve (N), (L), and (MCMF), where n is the number of nodes, m is the number of edges, k is the number of terminals, A is the maximum of edge-costs, C is the total sum of edge-capacities.*

To the best of our knowledge, our algorithm is the first combinatorial polynomial time algorithm for (N) and (L), and the first combinatorial algorithm for (MCMF) with an explicit polynomial running time.

In Section 3.1, we formulate a dual of (N) as a convex location problem on a (topological) tree $\mathcal{T}$ that is the union of the coordinate axises in $\mathbf{R}_+^S$, and establish the half-integrality (Proposition 3.6). Then we give an optimality criterion (Lemma 3.7) for (N). In Section 3.2, we explain an algorithm to construct an optimal multiflow in (N) from a given optimal dual solution. This algorithm is a slight modification of the algorithm of [29] devised for (M). In Section 3.3, we present an algorithm to solving a dual of (N), providing the proof of Theorem 3.5. By the half-integrality, the dual of (N) is the minimization of a 2-separable L-convex function on a tree obtained by joining half-integral points in $\mathcal{T}$. We will design a proximity scaling algorithm by considering a 2-separable L-convex function minimization over the tree of 2^σ-integral points in each scaling phase σ. The time complexity will be estimated by the results of the previous section. We also sketch how to adapt our algorithm to solve (M). In Section 3.4, we give additional results and remarks. In particular, we explain that our combinatorial algorithm gives a practical implementation of Fukunaga's 4/3-approximation algorithm [9] for capacitated terminal backup problem. We also give a further simple and instructive but pseudo-polynomial time algorithm to solve (N).

3.1 Duality

We first formulate a dual of (N) as a continuous location problem on a tree (in topological sense). Let $\mathbf{R}^S$ denote the set of functions on S. For each terminal $s \in S$, let e_s denote the function defined by $e_s(s) := 1$ and $e_s(t) := 0$ for $t \neq s$. Namely e_s is the sth unit vector of $\mathbf{R}^S$. Let $\mathcal{T}_s := \mathbf{R}_+ e_s$, and let $\mathcal{T} := \bigcup_{s \in S} \mathcal{T}_s \subseteq \mathbf{R}^S$. The metric D on $\mathcal{T}$ is defined by

$$D(p,q) := \begin{cases} |p(s) - q(s)| & \text{if } p, q \in \mathcal{T}_s \text{ for } s \in S, \\ |p(s)| + |q(t)| & \text{if } p \in \mathcal{T}_s, q \in \mathcal{T}_t \text{ for distinct } s, t \in S, \end{cases} \qquad (p, q \in \mathcal{T}).$$

The space $\mathcal{T}$ is isometric to a *star* obtained by gluing half-lines $\mathbf{R}_+$ along the origin. Notice that D is not equal to an induced metric on $\mathbf{R}^S$.

Let $V = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Consider the following continuous location problem on $\mathcal{T}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \textbf{(D)}\text{: Max.} \quad & \sum_{s \in S} r(s) D(0, p_s) - \sum_{ij \in E} c(ij)(D(p_i, p_j) - a(ij))^+ \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & p = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{T}, \\ & p_s \in \mathcal{T}_s \quad (s \in S), \end{aligned}$$

where $(z)^+$ denotes $\max(0, z)$. A feasible solution p of (D) is called a *potential*, and called *half-integral* if each p_i is a half-integral vector in $\mathbf{R}^S$. A potential p is called *proper* if $D(0, p_i) \leq D(0, p_s)$ for each $s \in S$ and $i \in V$ with $p_i \in \mathcal{T}_s$.

Proposition 3.6. *The minimum value of (N) is equal to the maximum value of (D). Moreover there exists a proper half-integral optimal potential in (D).*

We will give an algorithmic proof in Section 3.4.3, and here give a sketch of the proof.

Sketch of proof. For a (half-integral) potential p and a terminal $s \in S$, let p' be a (half-integral) potential defined by $p'_i := p_s$ if $p_i \in \mathcal{T}_s$ and $D(0, p_i) > D(0, p_s)$, and $p'_i := p_i$ otherwise. Then

the objective value of (D) does not decrease. Therefore there always exists a proper optimal potential in (D).

Let $\mathcal{C} := \bigcup_{s\in S} \mathcal{C}_s$. The LP-dual of (L) is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} (3.3) \qquad \text{Max.} \quad & \sum_{s\in S} r(s) \sum_{X\in\mathcal{C}_s} \pi(X) - \sum_{e\in E} c(e) \left(\sum_{X\in\mathcal{C}: e\in\delta X} \pi(X) - a(e) \right)^+ \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \pi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbf{R}_+. \end{aligned}$$

By the standard uncrossing argument, one can show that there always exists an optimal solution π such that for $X, Y \in \operatorname{supp}\pi := \{X \in \mathcal{C} \mid \pi(X) > 0\}$, it holds $X \subseteq Y$ or $X \supseteq Y$ if $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}_s$ for $s \in S$, and $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ if $X \in \mathcal{C}_s$ and $Y \in \mathcal{C}_{s'}$ for distinct $s, s' \in S$. Such a solution is called *laminar*.

Thus it suffices to show that for a proper potential p there is $\pi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbf{R}_+$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} (3.4) \qquad \sum_{X\in\mathcal{C}: e\in\delta X} \pi(X) &= D(p_i, p_j) \quad (ij \in E), \\ \sum_{X\in\mathcal{C}_s} \pi(X) &= D(0, p_s) \quad (s \in S), \end{aligned}$$

and that for a laminar solution $\pi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbf{R}_+$, there is a proper potential p satisfying (3.4).

Let $p = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n)$ be a proper potential. For $s \in S$ with $p_s \neq 0$, suppose that $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n\} \cap (\mathcal{T}_s \setminus \{0\}) = \{q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_{k_s} = p_s\}$ with $0 < D(0, q_1) < D(0, q_2) < \cdots < D(0, q_{k_s})$. For $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k_s$, define X^s_j and π^s_j by

$$X^s_j := \{i \in V \mid p_i \in \{q_j, q_{j+1}, \ldots, q_{k_s}\}\},\ \pi^s_j := D(q_{j-1}, q_j),$$

where we let $q_0 := 0$. Then $X^s_j \in \mathcal{C}_s$. Define $\pi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbf{R}_+$ by $\pi(X^s_j) := \pi^s_j$ and $\pi(X) := 0$ for other X. Then (3.4) holds.

Conversely, let π be a laminar solution of (3.3). Then we can assume that $\operatorname{supp}\pi \cap \mathcal{C}_s = \{X^s_1, X^s_2, \ldots X^s_{k_s}\}$ with $X^s_1 \supset X^s_2 \supset \cdots \supset X^s_{k_s} \ni s$. For each node i, if i does not belong to any member of $\operatorname{supp}\pi$, then define $p_i := 0$. Otherwise there uniquely exist $s \in S$ and $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k_s\}$ such that $i \in X^s_j$ and $i \notin X^s_{j+1}$, where $X^s_{k_s+1} := \emptyset$. Define $p_i := (\sum_{l=1}^{j} \pi(X^s_l))e_s \in \mathcal{T}_s$. Then we obtain a proper potential $p = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n)$ of (D) satisfying (3.4).

By Theorem 3.4, for every cost vector a (not necessarily nonnegative) there exists a half-integral optimal solution in (L). By the total dual (half-)integrality, there exists a half-integral laminar optimal solution in (3.3), and there exists a half-integral optimal potential in (D). □

We next provide an optimality criterion for (N) and (D). For a potential p, an (s, t)-path $P = (s = i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_l = t)$ is said to be *p-geodesic* if

$$\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} D(p_{i_k}, p_{i_{k+1}}) = D(p_s, p_t).$$

Observe from the triangle inequality that $(\geq)$ always holds.

Lemma 3.7. *A feasible flow $f = (\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ and a potential p are both optimal if and only if they satisfy the following conditions:*

(1) *For each edge ij, if $D(p_i, p_j) > a(ij)$, then $f(ij) = c(ij)$.*

(2) *For each edge ij, if $D(p_i, p_j) < a(ij)$, then $f(ij) = 0$.*

(3) *For each path P in $\mathcal{P}$, if $\lambda(P) > 0$, then P is p-geodesic.*

(4) *For each terminal s, if $D(0, p_s) > 0$, then $f(s) = r(s)$.*

Proof. For a path $P = (i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_l)$, let $D(p(P)) := \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} D(p_{i_k}, p_{i_{k+1}})$. The statement follows from the previous proposition, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{ij\in E} a(ij)f(ij) - \sum_{s\in S} r(s)D(0,p_s) + \sum_{ij\in E} c(ij)(D(p_i,p_j) - a(ij))^+ \\
&= \sum_{ij\in E} a(ij)f(ij) + \sum_{ij\in E} c(ij)(D(p_i,p_j) - a(ij))^+ - \sum_{ij\in E} f(ij)D(p_i,p_j) \\
&\quad + \sum_{ij\in E} f(ij)D(p_i,p_j) - \sum_{st} f(s,t)D(p_s,p_t) + \sum_{st} f(s,t)D(p_s,p_t) - \sum_{s\in S} r(s)D(0,p_s) \\
&= \sum_{ij\in E} (D(p_i,p_j) - a(ij))^+\{c(ij) - f(ij)\} + \sum_{ij\in E} (a(ij) - D(p_i,p_j))^+ f(ij) \\
&\quad + \sum_{st} \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}: P \text{ connects } s,t} \lambda(P)\{D(p(P)) - D(p_s,p_t)\} + \sum_{s\in S}(f(s) - r(s))D(0,p_s),
\end{aligned}$$

where st is taken over all unordered pairs of distinct terminals, and we use

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{ij\in E} f(ij)D(p_i,p_j) &= \sum_{ij\in E} \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}: e\in P} \lambda(P)D(p_i,p_j) = \sum_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \lambda(P)D(p(P)), \\
\sum_{st} f(s,t)D(p_s,p_t) &= \sum_{st} f(s,t)\left\{D(p_s,0) + D(0,p_t)\right\} = \sum_{s\in S} f(s)D(0,p_s).
\end{aligned}$$

□

3.2 Double covering network

Here we describe an algorithm to construct an optimal multiflow in (N) from an optimal potential p in (D) under the condition that each edge-cost is positive:

(CP) $a(e) > 0$ for each edge $e \in E$.

We will see in Remark 3.11 that we can assume (CP) by a perturbation technique. As Karzanov [29] did for (M), a half-integral optimal multiflow f in (N) is also obtained by an integral circulation of a certain directed network (*double covering network*) $\mathcal{D}_p$ associated with an optimal potential p.

Let p be a (proper) potential. Let U_0 denote the set of non-terminal nodes i with $p_i = 0$. For each terminal $s \in S$, let U_s denote the set of nodes consisting of terminal s and non-terminal nodes i with $p_i \in \mathcal{T}_s \setminus \{0\}$. Then V is the disjoint union of U_0 and U_s for $s \in S$. Let $E_=$ denote the set of edges ij with $D(p_i,p_j) = a(ij)$, and let $E_>$ denote the set of edges ij with $D(p_i,p_j) > a(ij)$.

The *double covering network* $\mathcal{D}_p$ relative to p is a directed network constructed as follows. For each terminal s, consider two nodes s^+, s^-. For each non-terminal node i not in U_0, consider two nodes i^+, i^-. For each (non-terminal) node i in U_0, consider $2|S|$ nodes i^{s+}, i^{s-} ($s \in S$). The node set of $\mathcal{D}_p$ consists of these nodes. Next we define the edge set A of $\mathcal{D}_p$. For each edge $ij \in E_= \cup E_>$, define the edge set A_{ij} by:

$$A_{ij} := \begin{cases} \{j^+i^+, i^-j^-\} & \text{if } i,j \in U_s, D(0,p_i) < D(0,p_j), \\ \{j^+i^{s+}, i^{s-}j^-\} & \text{if } i \in U_0, j \in U_s, \\ \{i^+j^-, j^+i^-\} & \text{if } i \in U_s, j \in U_t, s \neq t. \end{cases}$$




Figure 1: Double covering network

Notice that for $ij \in E_= \cup E_>$, potentials p_i and p_j are different points in $\mathcal{T}$ since $a(ij)$ is positive. The upper capacity of the two edges in A_{ij} is defined as $c(ij)$. The lower capacity is defined as 0 if $ij \in E_=$ and $c(ij)$ if $ij \in E_>$. For each (non-terminal) node i in U_0, the edge set B_i is defined as $\{i^{s+}i^{t-} \mid s,t \in S, s \neq t\}$. The lower capacity and the upper capacity of these edges are defined as 0 and ∞, respectively. For terminal $s \in S$, add edge s^-s^+. The lower capacity is defined as $r(s)$, and the upper capacity is defined as ∞ if $p_s = 0$ and $r(s)$ otherwise. The edge set of $\mathcal{D}_p$ is the (disjoint) union of all edge sets A_{ij} ($ij \in E_= \cup E_>$), B_i ($i \in U_0$), $\{s^-s^+\}$ ($s \in S$) (as a multiset). As in Figure 1, readers may imagine that $\mathcal{D}_p$ is embedded into $\mathcal{T}$ by the map $i^\pm \mapsto p_i$,

Consider an integral feasible circulation $\phi : A \to \mathbf{Z}_+$ of this network (if it exists). Decompose ϕ into the sum of characteristic vectors of directed cycles $C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_{m'}$ with positive integral coefficients $q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_{m'}$, where m' is at most the number of edges of $\mathcal{D}_p$. By construction of $\mathcal{D}_p$, any directed cycle must meet s^-s^+ for some terminal s, and next meets t^-t^+ for other terminal t after meeting s^-s^+. Delete all terminal edges s^-s^+ from each C_l, and obtain directed paths $P_l^1, P_l^2, \ldots, P_l^{n_l}$ ($n_l \leq |S|$). Then each P_l^j is a path from s^+ to t^- for distinct $s,t \in S$. Let $\bar{P}_l^r$ be the S-path in the original network $\mathcal{N}$ obtained from P_l^r by replacing $i^\pm$ or $i^{s\pm}$ by i (and removing $i^{s+}i^{t-}$). Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the union of S-paths $\bar{P}_l^r$ over $l = 1, 2, \ldots, m', r = 1, 2, \ldots, n_l$. Let $\lambda(\bar{P}_l^r) := q_l^r/2$. Then $f_\phi := (\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ is a half-integral multiflow; we see in the proof of the next lemma that f_ϕ indeed satisfies the capacity constraint.

Proposition 3.8. *A potential p is optimal if and only if there exists a feasible circulation in $\mathcal{D}_p$. Moreover, for any (integral) feasible circulation ϕ, the (half-integral) multiflow f_ϕ is optimal to (P).*

Proof. (Only if part). Let $f = (\mathcal{P}, \lambda)$ be an optimal multiflow. Then f satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.7. Consider an path $P = (s = i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_k = t)$ in $\mathcal{P}$ with $\lambda(P) > 0$. By condition (2) with (CP), each edge in P belongs to $E_= \cup E_>$. By condition (4), there are an index l such that $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_l \in U_s$ and $i_{l+1}, i_{l+2}, \ldots, i_k \in U_t$ with $D(0, p_{i_0}) > D(0, p_{i_1}) > \cdots > D(0, p_{i_l}) > 0 < D(0, p_{i_{l+1}}) < D(0, p_{i_{l+2}}) < \cdots < D(0, p_{i_k})$, or $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_{l-1} \in U_s$,

$i_l \in U_0$, and $i_{l+1}, i_{l+2}, \ldots, i_k \in U_t$ with $D(0,p_{i_0}) > D(0,p_{i_1}) > \cdots > D(0,p_{i_{l-1}}) > 0 = D(0,p_{i_l}) < D(0,p_{i_{l+1}}) < D(0,p_{i_{l+2}}) < \cdots < D(0,p_{i_k})$. For the former case, the union of A_{ij} over edges ij in P forms an (s^+,t^-)-path and an (t^+,s^-)-path. For the latter case, the union of $\{i_l^{s+}i_l^{t-}, i_l^{t+}i_l^{s-}\}$ and A_{ij} over edges ij in P forms an (s^+,t^-)-path and an (t^+,s^-)-path. Hence a feasible circulation ϕ_f is constructed as follows. For each terminal s, define $\phi_f(s^-s^+) := f(s)$. For each edge $ij \in E_= \cup E_>$, define $\phi_f(\vec{e}) := f(ij)$ for $\vec{e} \in A_{ij}$. For each non-terminal node $i \in U_0$ and distinct $s,t \in S$, define $\phi_f(i^{s+}i^{t-})$ as the total flow-value of (s,t)-flows in f using node i. Then the resulting ϕ_f is a feasible circulation in $\mathcal{D}_p$.

(If part). We verify that p and f_ϕ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.7. Since there is no edge in $\mathcal{D}_p$ coming from $ij \in E$ with $a(ij) - D(p_i,p_j) > 0$, the multiflow f_ϕ does not use edge ij with $a(ij) - D(p_i,p_j) > 0$, and hence satisfies the condition (2). Observe that $f_\phi(e) = (\phi(e^+) + \phi(e^-))/2 (\leq c(e))$ for an edge $e = ij \in E_= \cup E_>$ with $A_{ij} = \{e^+, e^-\}$. From this, if $e \in E_>$, then $f_\phi(e) = (\phi(e^+) + \phi(e^-))/2 = c(e)$, proving the condition (1). For terminal s, $\phi(s^-s^+)$ is the sum of q_j over indices j such that the cycle C_j contains s^-s^+, which is equal to the sum of $\lambda(\bar{P}_l^r)$ over S-paths $\bar{P}_l^r$ connecting terminal s, i.e., $f_\phi(s)$. Thus $f_\phi(s) = \phi(s^-s^+) \geq r(s)$; in particular f_ϕ is feasible to r. Moreover $f_\phi(s) = r(s)$ if $s \in U_s$, proving the condition (4).

Finally consider condition (3) for $P = (s = i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_l = t) \in \mathcal{P}$. Observe from the construction of $\mathcal{D}_p$ that $p_{i_k} \neq p_{i_{k+1}}$, and $D(p_{i_{k-1}}, p_{i_{k+1}}) = D(p_{i_{k-1}}, p_{i_k}) + D(p_{i_k}, p_{i_{k+1}})$. Since the metric space $\mathcal{T}$ is a tree, we obtain $D(p(P)) = D(p_s, p_t)$; see the next lemma. □

In the last part of the proof, we use the following distance property of a tree, which we can easily prove (by an inductive argument).

Lemma 3.9. *Let G be a tree (with a positive edge-length), and let $x = x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_l = y$ be a sequence of vertices in G. Suppose that*

(1) *$x_i \neq x_{i+1}$ for $i = 0,1,2,\ldots,l-1$, and*

(2) *$d(x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}) = d(x_{i-1}, x_i) + d(x_i, x_{i+1})$ for $i = 1,2,\ldots,l-1$.*

Then $\sum_{i=0}^{l-1} d(x_i, x_{i+1}) = d(x,y)$.

A simple example (x,z,z,x) shows that the condition (1) is necessary.

Remark 3.10 (Role of cost positivity)**.** One may wonder why the edge-cost positivity (CP) is needed. Consider the case where some of edges have zero cost. There may exist edges $ij \in E_=$ with $D(p_i,p_j) = 0$. Therefore we need to add edges to $\mathcal{D}_p$ corresponding to those edges. Even if we manage to construct a set $\mathcal{P}$ of paths from a feasible circulation in a modified network, consecutive nodes in some path P may have the same potential, and does not guarantee that P is p-geodesic (P may connect the same terminal).

Remark 3.11 (How to make edge-cost positive)**.** The modification is the same as that given in [14, 29] used for (M). Let Z denote the set of edges e with $a(e) = 0$. Define a positive edge-cost a' by

$$a'(e) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in Z, \\ (2C(Z)+1)a(e) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad (e \in E). \tag{3.5}$$

Then any half-integral optimal solution x in (L) with edge-cost a' is also optimal to (L) with edge-cost a. Indeed, by the half-integrality theorem (Theorem 3.4), it suffices to show that for every half-integral solution y in (L) with cost a it holds

$$ax - ay \leq 0,$$

where we simply denote $\sum a(e)x(e)$ by ax. Indeed, we have

$$(2C(Z)+1)ax - (2C(Z)+1)ay = a'x - a'y - x(Z) + y(Z) \leq C(Z).$$

This implies that $ax - ay \leq C(Z)/(2C(Z)+1) < 1/2$. Since ax and ay are half-integers, we have $ax - ay \leq 0$, as required.

3.3 Proximity scaling algorithm

In this section we present an algorithm to prove Theorem 3.5. By the arguments in the previous section, it suffices to solve (D). Let $\omega : \mathcal{T}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ be defined by

$$\omega(p) := \sum_{ij \in E} c(ij)(D(p_i, p_j) - a(ij))^+ + \sum_{s \in S} I_s(p_s) - r(s)D(0, p_s) \quad (p \in \mathcal{T}^n), \tag{3.6}$$

where I_s denotes the indicator function of $\mathcal{T}_s$:

$$I_s(q) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } q \in \mathcal{T}_s, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (q \in \mathcal{T}).$$

Then (D) is equivalent to the minimization of ω. The range in which an optimum exists is given as follows, where $A := \max\{a(e) \mid e \in E\}$.

Lemma 3.12. *There exists a proper half-integral optimal potential p such that $D(0, p_i) \leq nA$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.*

Proof. Take a proper half-integral optimal potential p. Suppose that $D(0, p_s) > nA$ for $s \in S$, and that $\{p_i \mid i \in U_s\} = \{q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_l = p_s\}$ with $D(0, q_j) < D(0, q_{j+1})$. Let $q_0 := 0$. Then $l \leq n$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{l} D(q_{j-1}, q_j) = D(0, p_s) > nA$. Thus there is an index $k(\geq 1)$ with $D(q_{k-1}, q_k) > A$. Let $X := \{i \in U_s \mid p_i \in \{q_k, q_{k+1}, \ldots, q_l\}\}$. For each $ij \in \delta X$, it holds $D(p_i, p_j) \geq D(q_{k-1}, q_k) > A \geq a(ij)$. Hence $\delta X \subseteq E_>$. Let $\alpha := D(q_{k-1}, q_k) - A > 0$, which is a half-integer. Define proper half-integral potential p' by

$$p'_i := \begin{cases} p_i - \alpha e_s & \text{if } i \in X (\ni s), \\ p_i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (i \in V). \tag{3.7}$$

Then $D(p'_i, p'_j) = D(p_i, p_j) - \alpha$ if $ij \in \delta X$ with $i \in X$, and $D(p'_i, p'_j) = D(p_i, p_j)$ otherwise. Also $D(0, p'_s) = D(0, p_s) - \alpha$ and $D(0, p'_t) = D(0, p_t)$ for other terminal $t \neq s$. By feasibility (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(p') - \omega(p) &= \sum_{ij \in \delta X} c(ij)\{D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j)\} - r(s)\{D(0, p'_s) - D(0, p_s)\} \\ &= -\alpha\{c(\delta X) - r(s)\} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus p' is also optimal. Let $p := p'$. Repeat this procedure to obtain an optimal potential p as required. □

Let $L := \lceil \log nA \rceil$, and let $\mathcal{T}'$ be the subset of points q of $\mathcal{T}$ with $D(0, q) \leq 2^L$. By the above lemma, (D) is equivalent to the minimization of ω over $(\mathcal{T}')^n$. For $\sigma = -1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots, L$, let T_σ denote the tree on $\mathcal{T}' \cap (2^\sigma \mathbf{Z}^S)$ such that vertices u, v are adjacent if $D(u, v) = 2^\sigma$. In particular, T_σ is a (graph-theoretical) tree discretizing $\mathcal{T}'$. The graph metric of T_σ is denoted by d_σ. Then it holds

$$2^\sigma d_\sigma(u, v) = D(u, v).$$

The two color classes of T_σ are denoted by B_σ and W_σ, and suppose $0 \in B_\sigma$. Then $T_{\sigma-1}$ is naturally identified with the subdivision of T_σ. Hence

$$T_{\sigma-1} = (T_\sigma)^*, \quad B_{\sigma-1} = T_\sigma. \tag{3.8}$$

For $s \in S$, define $f_{s,\sigma} : T_\sigma \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ by

$$f_{s,\sigma}(p) := I_s(p) - r(s)2^\sigma d_\sigma(0, p) \quad (p \in T_\sigma).$$

For each edge $ij \in E$, define $g_{ij,\sigma} : \mathbf{Z} \to \mathbf{R}$ by

$$g_{ij,\sigma}(z) := c(ij)(2^\sigma z - a(ij))^+ \quad (z \in \mathbf{Z}).$$

Let $\omega_\sigma : {T_\sigma}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ be the restriction of ω to ${T_\sigma}^n$, which is given by

$$\omega_\sigma(p) = \sum_{s\in S} f_{s,\sigma}(p_s) + \sum_{ij\in E} g_{ij,\sigma}(d_\sigma(p_i, p_j)) \quad (p \in {T_\sigma}^n).$$

For each edge ij, consider even function $\bar{g}_{ij,\sigma} : \mathbf{Z} \to \mathbf{R}$ defined as in Section 2.4. Namely let $\bar{g}_{ij,\sigma}(z) := (g_{ij,\sigma}(z-1) + g_{ij,\sigma}(z+1))/2$ if z is odd and $\bar{g}_{ij,\sigma}(z) := g_{ij,\sigma}(z)$ if z is even. Define $\bar{\omega}_\sigma : {T_\sigma}^n \to \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ by

$$\bar{\omega}_\sigma(p) = \sum_{s\in S} f_{s,\sigma}(p_s) + \sum_{ij\in E} \bar{g}_{ij,\sigma}(d_\sigma(p_i, p_j)) \quad (p \in {T_\sigma}^n).$$

Lemma 3.13. (1) *ω_σ and $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ are (2-separable) L-extendable and L-convex on ${T_\sigma}^n$, respectively.*

(2) *$\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ is an L-convex relaxation of $\omega_{\sigma+1}$.*

(3) *Any minimizer of $\bar{\omega}_{-1}$ is optimal to (D).*

Proof. (1). Observe that $f_{s,\sigma}$ is convex on T_σ. Obviously $g_{ij,\sigma}$ is convex on $\mathbf{Z}$. Apply Lemma 2.14 and Theorem 2.15 to obtain the claim.

(2). Let $p \in {T_{\sigma+1}}^n = {B_\sigma}^n$. Then $d_\sigma(p_i, p_j)$ is an even integer, and $\bar{g}_{ij,\sigma}(d_\sigma(p_i, p_j)) = g_{ij,\sigma}(d_\sigma(p_i, p_j))$. Hence $\omega_\sigma(p) = \omega(p) = \omega_{\sigma+1}(p)$.

(3). We show $\bar{\omega}_{-1} = \omega_{-1}$. From the view of the proof of (2), it suffices to show that $\bar{g}_{ij,-1}(z) = g_{ij,-1}(z)$ for any odd integer z. Since $a(ij)$ is an integer, either $(z-1)/2, (z+1)/2 \le a(ij)$ or $(z-1)/2, (z+1)/2 \ge a(ij)$ holds. From this, we see $\bar{g}_{ij,-1}(z) = g_{ij,-1}(z)$. Notice that T_{-1} is the set of half-integral potentials. The claim follows from the half-integrality (Proposition 3.6). □

Thus our goal is to minimize the L-convex function ω_{-1}. We are now ready to describe our scaling algorithm to solve (D):

Proximity scaling algorithm:

Step 0: Replace a by a' defined by (3.5) if a is not positive. Let $\sigma := L = \lceil \log nA \rceil$ and $p^{\sigma+1} := (0, 0, \ldots, 0) \in {B_\sigma}^n$.

Step 1: Find a minimizer $p^\sigma \in {T_\sigma}^n$ of $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ by the steepest descent algorithm with initial point $p^{\sigma+1}$.

Step 2: If $\sigma = -1$, then $p = p^{-1}$ is an optimal solution of (D), and go to step 3. Otherwise, let $\sigma \leftarrow \sigma - 1$ and go to step 1.

Step 3: Construct $\mathcal{D}_p$, and find an integral feasible circulation ϕ. Then f_ϕ is a half-integral optimal multiflow in (N) as required.

The time complexity of step 1 is estimated as follows.

Lemma 3.14. $d_\sigma(\mathrm{opt}(\bar{\omega}_\sigma), p^{\sigma+1}) \leq 6n + 4$.

Proof. We show the existence of a minimizer q^* of $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ with $d_\sigma(q^*, p^{\sigma+1}) \leq 6n+4$. First consider the case where $\sigma = L$ or $L-1$. In this case, the diameter of T_σ is 2 or 4. Hence the inequality obviously holds. Consider the case $\sigma \leq L-2$. Then $p^{\sigma+1}$ is a minimizer of an L-convex relaxation $\bar{\omega}_{\sigma+1}$ of $\omega_{\sigma+2}$ (Lemma 3.13 (2)). By the persistency (Theorem 2.10), there exists a minimizer q of $\omega_{\sigma+2}$ (over ${T_{\sigma+2}}^n$) with $d_{\sigma+1}(p^{\sigma+1}, q) \leq 1$. Since q is also a minimizer of L-extendable function $\omega_{\sigma+1}$ (on ${T_{\sigma+1}}^n = (B_{\sigma+1} \cup W_{\sigma+1})^n$) over ${B_{\sigma+1}}^n$, by proximity theorem (Theorem 2.11), there is a minimizer q' of $\omega_{\sigma+1}$ (over ${T_{\sigma+1}}^n$) with $d_{\sigma+1}(q', q) \leq 2n$. Since $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ is an L-convex relaxation of $\omega_{\sigma+1}$, the restriction of $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ to ${B_\sigma}^n = {T_{\sigma+1}}^n$ is equal to $\omega_{\sigma+1}$. Hence q' is a minimizer of $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ over ${B_{\sigma+1}}^n$. Since $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ is also midpoint L-extendable on ${T_\sigma}^n = (B_\sigma \cup W_\sigma)^n$, by the proximity theorem, there is a minimizer q^* of $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ over ${T_\sigma}^n$ with $d_\sigma(q^*, q') \leq 2n$. Notice $2d_{\sigma+1} = d_\sigma$. Thus we have

$$d_\sigma(p^{\sigma+1}, q^*) \leq d_\sigma(p^{\sigma+1}, q) + d_\sigma(q, q') + d_\sigma(q', q^*) \leq 2 + 4n + 2n$$

as required. □

Therefore, by Theorem 2.6, the number of iterations of the steepest descent algorithm is at most $6n + 4$. Since $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ is a 2-separable L-convex function consisting of $O(m)$ terms, and the maximum degree of T_σ is the number k of terminals, by Theorem 2.16 we can find an optimal solution in $O(n\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$ time. The total step is $O(nL\,\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$, where L can be taken to be $\lceil \log 2(C(Z)+1)nA \rceil = O(\log nAC)$. This proves Theorem 3.5.

Algorithm for (M). Let us sketch a proximity scaling algorithm to solve (M). Corresponding to (D), consider the following location problem on $\mathcal{T}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathrm{D}'):\ \text{Max.} \quad & \sum_{ij \in E} c(ij)(D(p_i, p_j) - a(ij))^+ \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & p = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n) \in \mathcal{T}^n, \\ & p_s = \mu e_s/2 \quad (s \in S). \end{aligned}$$

Again a feasible solution of (D′) is called a potential, and called half-integral if each p_i is half-integral. The following duality is implicit in [17, 29].

Proposition 3.15 (see [17, 29])**.** *The maximum value of (M) is equal to the minimum value of (D′). Moreover, if μ is an integer, then there exists a half-integral optimal potential in (D′).*

Sketch of proof. The edge-capacitated formulation is transformed to the node-capacitated formulation, discussed in [17], as follows. Replace each edge $e = ij$ by the series of two edges iu and uj. Define the node-capacity and the node-cost of the new node u by $c(e)$ and $a(e)$. No edge-capacity and edge-cost are given. The node-capacities of the original nodes are ∞. Then (M) becomes a node-capacitated problem, and the results in [17, Section 4] are applicable. In particular, the dual of (M) is given by the problem (4.6) of [17] in setting $\bar{\Gamma} := \mathcal{T}$ and $\bar{R}_s := \{\mu e_s/2\}$. Subtree $F(i)$ for the original node i is a single point p_i (by $b(x) = \infty$), and hence $F(u)$ for new node u replacing original edge ij is a path between p_i and p_j with length (diameter) $D(p_i, p_j)$. Thus (4.6) of [17] becomes (D′). The half-integrality follows from [17, Remark 4.7]. □

By the same argument in the proof of Lemma 3.7, one can prove that a multiflow f and a potential p are both optimal if and only if they satisfy conditions (1), (2), and (3) in Lemma 3.7. The corresponding double covering network $\mathcal{D}'_p$ is obtained by replacing the lower bound and the upper bound capacities of s^-s^+ of $\mathcal{D}_p$ by 0 and ∞, respectively. Then we obtain an analogue of Proposition 3.8 that p is optimal if and only if there exists a feasible circulation ϕ in $\mathcal{D}'_p$, and f_ϕ is an optimal multiflow in (M). We may consider that the variables of (D′) are p_i for non-terminal nodes $i \in V \setminus S$ (since a potential p_s of each terminal s is fixed to $\mu e_s/2$ in (D′)). For non-terminal node i, define $f_i : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbf{R}_+$ by $f_i(q) := \sum_{s \in S: si \in E} c(si) D(\mu e_s/2, q)$. We may assume that the set of non-terminal nodes are $\{1, 2, \ldots, n-k\}$. Then (D′) is the minimization of $\omega(p) := \sum_{1 \le i \le n-k} f_i(p_i) + \sum_{ij \in E: 1 \le i,j \le n-k} c(ij)(D(p_i, p_j) - a(ij))^+$. Again it is easy to see that there is an optimal potential p with $D(0, p_i) \le \mu/2$. For $\sigma = -1, 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, define T_σ, $g_{ij,\sigma}$, $\bar{g}_{ij,\sigma}$, ω_σ, and $\bar{\omega}_\sigma$ as above. Then Lemma 3.13 holds in this setting. Let $L := \lceil \log \mu \rceil$. By the proximity scaling algorithm, we can minimize ω' in $O((n-k)\lceil \log \mu \rceil \mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$ time.

It is shown in [14, 29] that if $\mu \ge 2A_1C + 1$ for $A_1 := \sum_{e \in E} a(e)$ and $C = \sum_{e \in E} c(e)$, then every half-integral optimal multiflow in (M) is a minimum cost multiflow. Also it is shown in [14, 29] that cost a is replaced by a' (defined by (3.5)) to satisfy the cost positivity. Any half-integral optimal multiflow in (M) with cost a' is optimal for original cost a. Thus, letting $\mu := 2A'_1C + 1 = O(A_1C)$, we obtain a minimum cost half-integral multiflow in $O((n-k)\log(A_1C)\mathrm{MF}(kn, km))$ time.

3.4 Additional results and remarks

3.4.1 Lovász-Cherkassky formula, k-submodular function, and multiway cut

We note a relation between Lovász-Cherkassky formula (Theorem 3.1), k-submodular function minimization, and multiway cut. Suppose that S consists of k terminals, and the set of non-terminal nodes is $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Recall notions in Section 2.1. Adding 0 to S, we obtain poset S_k, and consider the following k-submodular function minimization:

$$\begin{aligned} (3.9) \qquad \text{Min.} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \le i \le n} \sum_{s \in S: si \in E} c(si)\delta(s, p_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij \in E: 1 \le i,j \le n} c(ij)\delta(p_i, p_j) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & p = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n) \in {S_k}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Recall Example 2.17 with $d = \delta$ that this problem is nothing but a k-submodular relaxation (or an L-convex relaxation) of multiway cut.

Furthermore this problem is also a dual of maximum free multiflow problem (MF), and hence the optimal value of this problem is equal to $\sum_{s \in S} \kappa_s/2$. To see this, for $p \in {S_k}^n$ and $s \in S$, let $X^p_s := \{s\} \cup \{i \mid p_i = s\}$. Then X^p_s is an $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-cut. Observe $\sum_{s \in S} c(\delta X^p_s)/2$ is equal to the objective value of (3.9) at p. Conversely, take a minimum $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-cut X_s for each $s \in S$. We can assume that X_s ($s \in S$) are disjoint. If $X_s \cap X_t \ne \emptyset$, then, by submodularity, we can replace X_s by $X_s \setminus X_t$ and X_t by $X_t \setminus X_s$ without increasing the cut capacity. Define p by $p_i = s$ if $i \in X_s$ for some $s \in S$ and $p_i = 0$ otherwise. Then the objective value at p is equal to $\sum_{s \in S} c(\delta X_s)/2 = \sum_{s \in S} \kappa_s/2$. In particular, this k-submodular function minimization can be solved by $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-mincut computation for each $s \in S$.

3.4.2 Application to terminal backup problem

The linear program (L) arises as an LP-relaxation of a class of network design problems, called *terminal backup problems* [2, 43]. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with terminal set S and edge-cost $a : E \to \mathbf{Z}_+$ the terminal backup problem asks to find a minimum cost subgraph F with the property that each terminal s is reachable to other terminal in F. Anshelevich and

Karagiozova [2] proved that this problem is solvable in polynomial time. Bernáth, Kobayashi, and Matsuoka [3] considered the following weighted generalization. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with terminal set S, edge-cost $a : E \to \mathbf{Z}_+$, and a requirement $r : S \to \mathbf{Z}_+$, find a minimum cost integral edge-capacity $x : E \to \mathbf{Z}_+$ such that for each terminal s there is an integral $(s, S \setminus \{s\})$-flow in (V, E, x) with flow-value at least $r(s)$. They proved that this generalization is solvable in (strongly) polynomial time, and asked whether a natural capacitated version of this problem is tractable or not. The capacitated version is to impose the condition $x(e) \leq c(e)$ $(e \in E)$ for $c : E \to \mathbf{Z}_+$, and is formulated as the following integer program:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(CTB)} \quad \text{Min.} \quad & \sum_{e \in E} a(e)x(e) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(\delta X) \geq r(s) \quad (s \in S, X \in \mathcal{C}_s), \\ & x(e) \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, c(e)\} \quad (e \in E). \end{aligned}$$

The problem (L) is nothing but a natural LP-relaxation of (CTB).

Fukunaga [9] studied (CTB), and proved the half-integrality (Theorem 3.4) of the LP-relaxation (L). As was noted by him, a 2-approximation solution is immediately obtained from a half-integral optimal solution x in (L) by rounding each non-integral component $x(e)$ to $x(e)+1/2$. He devised a clever rounding algorithm to obtain a 4/3-approximation solution. Our algorithm gives a practical and combinatorial implementation of his 4/3-approximation algorithm, as follows. A half-integral optimal solution x of (L) and an optimal potential p of (D) are obtained by our combinatorial algorithm. Fukunaga's algorithm rounds a special half-integral optimal solution $\tilde{x}$ obtained from x by the following fixing procedure. Let E_1 be the set of edges e with $x(e) \in \mathbf{Z}$. Let $\tilde{x}(e) := x(e)$ for $e \in E_1$. For an edge $e \in E \setminus E_1$ (with non-integral $x(e)$), check whether there is an optimal solution y in (L) such that $y(e) \in \{\lfloor x(e) \rfloor, \lceil x(e) \rceil\}$, $\lfloor x(e') \rfloor \leq y(e') \leq \lceil x(e') \rceil$ for $e' \in E \setminus (E_1 \cup \{e\})$, and $y(e') = \tilde{x}(e')$ for $e' \in E_1$. If such y exists, then let $\tilde{x}(e) := y(e)$. Otherwise let $\tilde{x}(e) := x(e)$. Add e to E_1, and repeat until $E_1 = E$ to obtain $\tilde{x}$. This procedure can be implemented on the double covering network $\mathcal{D}_p$. By Lemma 3.3 with (CP), y is optimal to (L) if and only if y is the flow-support of some optimal multiflow f in (N). From view of (the proof of) Proposition 3.8, y is optimal if and only if there is a circulation ϕ of $\mathcal{D}_p$ with $y(ij) = \phi(\vec{e})$ for $ij \in E, \vec{e} \in A_{ij}$. Therefore the above procedure reduces to checking the existence of a circulation in $\mathcal{D}_p$ with changing the lower and upper capacities of edges in A_{ij} to $\lfloor x(e) \rfloor$ or $\lceil x(e) \rceil$ appropriately. Thus $\tilde{x}$ is obtained by at most m max-flow computations on $\mathcal{D}_p$.

3.4.3 Simple descent algorithm by double covering network

We here present a simple and instructive but pseudo-polynomial time algorithm solving (N) and (D) of the following description:

> For a potential p, find a feasible circulation ϕ in $\mathcal{D}_p$. If ϕ exists, then f_ϕ is an optimal multiflow, and stop. Otherwise, from an infeasibility certificate of $\mathcal{D}_p$, we obtain another potential p' with $\omega(p') < \omega(p)$. Let $p \to p'$ and repeat.

The presented algorithm can always keep p half-integral, providing an algorithmic proof of Proposition 3.6.

Assume the cost positivity (CP). For a (proper) half-integral potential p, construct the double covering network $\mathcal{D}_p$, as above. We reduce the circulation problem on $\mathcal{D}_p$ to the maximum flow problem on a modified network $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p$. Consider supper source a^+ and sink a^-. For each $ij \in E_{>0}$ modify edge set A_{ij} as follows. For each $uv \in A_{ij}$ replace uv by two edges ua^-, a^+v with (upper-)capacity $c(ij)$ (and lower-capacity 0). For each terminal $s \in S$, add new two edges s^-a^+ and s^+a^- with capacity $r(s)$. For edge s^-s^+, change the lower-capacity

to 0 and the upper-capacity to ∞ if $p_s = 0$ and to 0 otherwise. The resulting network is denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p$. Consider the maximum (a^+, a^-)-flow problem on the new network $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p$. This is a standard reduction of a circulation problem to a max-flow problem. In particular, $\mathcal{D}_p$ has a feasible circulation if and only if a maximum (a^+, a^-)-flow $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p$ saturates all edges leaving a^+ (entering a^-), i.e., $\{a^+\}$ is a minimum (a^+, a^-)-cut.

Let $\tilde{V}_1$ (resp. $\tilde{V}_2$) be the set of nodes i^+, i^-, i^{s+}, or i^{s-} such that i has an integral potential p_i (resp. non-integral potential p_i). By the integrality of $a(ij)$, there is no edge ij in $E_=$ such that i has an integral potential and j has a non-integral potential. Hence there is no edge connecting between $\tilde{V}_1$ and $\tilde{V}_2$.

An (a^+, a^-)-cut X in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p$ is called *legal* if

(1) $X \cap \tilde{V}_1$ or $X \cap \tilde{V}_2$ is empty,

(2) for each $i \in U_0$, $X \cap B_i$ is empty or $\{i^{s+}\} \cup \{i^{t-} \mid t \in S \setminus \{s\}\}$ for some $s \in S$, and

(3) for other node i, $X \cap \{i^+, i^-\}$ is empty, $\{i^+\}$, or $\{i^-\}$.

For a legal cut X of $\tilde{D}_p$, the potential p^X is defined by:

$$p_i^X := \begin{cases} e_s/2 & \text{if } i \in U_0 \text{ and } i^{s+} \in X \text{ for } s \in S, \\ p_i + e_s/2 & \text{if } i^+ \in X \text{ and } i \in U_s \text{ for } s \in S, \\ p_i - e_s/2 & \text{if } i^- \in X \text{ and } i \in U_s \text{ for } s \in S, \\ p_i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad (i \in V). \tag{3.10}$$

Then the following lemma holds; the proofs are given in the end of this section.

Lemma 3.16. (1) *For a legal cut X in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p$, we have*

$$\omega(p^X) - \omega(p) = \frac{1}{2}\{c(\delta X) - c(\delta\{a^+\})\}.$$

(2) *Let X be a (unique) inclusion-minimal minimum (a^+, a^-)-cut in $\tilde{D}_p$, and let $X_1 := X \setminus \tilde{V}_2$ and $X_2 := X \setminus \tilde{V}_1$. Then both X_1 and X_2 are legal cuts with*

$$c(\delta X) = c(\delta X_1) + c(\delta X_2) - c(\delta\{a^+\}).$$

In particular, if $c(\delta X) < c(\delta\{a^+\})$, then $c(\delta X_1) < c(\delta\{a^+\})$ or $c(\delta X_2) < c(\delta\{a^+\})$.

Therefore we can check the optimality of p by solving the maximum-flow problem on $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p$. If p is not optimal, then we obtain another half-integral potential p^X having a smaller objective value. This naturally provides the following algorithm:

Descent algorithm by double covering network

Step 0: Replace a by a' defined by (3.5) if a is not positive. Let $p := (0, 0, \ldots, 0)$.

Step 1: Construct $\tilde{D}_p$, and find a minimal minimum (a^+, a^-)-cut X and a maximum (a^+, a^-)-flow $\tilde{\phi}$.

Step 2: If $X = \{a^+\}$, then p is optimal, and construct a feasible circulation ϕ on $\mathcal{D}_p$ from $\tilde{\phi}$ and an optimal multiflow f_ϕ from ϕ; stop. Otherwise go to step 3.

Step 3: Let $X_1 := X \setminus \tilde{V}_2$ and $X_2 := X \setminus \tilde{V}_1$. Choose $j \in \{1, 2\}$ with $c(\delta X_j) < c(\delta\{a^+\})$. Let $p := p^{X_j}$ and go to step 1.

Observe that this algorithm coincides with the steepest descent algorithm applied to L-convex function ω_{-1} on ${T_{-1}}^n$, where p^{X_j} is a steepest direction of $\mathcal{I}(p)$ for even iterations and of $\mathcal{F}(p)$ for odd iterations. Thus, by Theorem 2.6 and Lemma 3.12, the number of the iteration is $O(nAC)$. The numbers of nodes and edges of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p$ are $O(kn)$ and $O(m + k^2 n)$, respectively. Thus we have:

Theorem 3.17. *The above algorithm runs in $O(nAC\,\mathrm{MF}(kn, m + k^2 n))$ time.*

Remark 3.18. In the above algorithm, each step minimizes a sum of basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions of type I and III (thanks to (CP)). The above network $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_p$ may be viewed as yet another representation of $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions. In fact, an arbitrary sum of basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions of type I and III admits this kind of a network representation (Yuta Ishii, Master Thesis, University of Tokyo, 2014). However this representation seems not to capture basic $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular functions of type II. In each scaling phase of the proximity scaling algorithm, the objective functions of local problems may contain a $\boldsymbol{k}$-submodular term of type II. This is why we need an algorithm in Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.16. (1). Let X be a legal cut (with finite cut capacity). Observe that

$$c(\delta X) = \sum_{ij \in E_= \cup E_>} c(ij)|\delta X \cap A_{ij}| + \sum_{s \in S} r(s)|\delta X \cap \{a^+ s^+, s^- a^-\}|. \tag{3.11}$$

In particular we have

$$c(\delta\{a^+\}) = \sum_{ij \in E_>} 2c(ij) + \sum_{s \in S} r(s). \tag{3.12}$$

Let $p' := p^X$. For an edge $ij \in E$, if p_i and p_j are integral and non-integral potentials, respectively, then $ij \notin E_=$ and $D(p_i, p_j) - 1/2 \le D(p'_i, p'_j) \le D(p_i, p_j) + 1/2$. Therefore $a(ij) > D(p_i, p_j)$ implies $a(ij) \ge D(p'_i, p'_j)$ and $a(ij) < D(p_i, p_j)$ implies $a(ij) \le D(p'_i, p'_j)$. Consequently we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(p') - \omega(p) &= \sum_{ij \in E_>} c(ij)(D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j)) + \sum_{ij \in E_=} c(ij)(D(p'_i, p'_j) - a(ij))^+ \\
&\quad - \sum_{s \in S} r(s)(D(0, p'_s) - D(0, p_s)). \\
&= \sum_{ij \in E_>} c(ij)(D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) + 1) + \sum_{ij \in E_=} c(ij)(D(p'_i, p'_j) - a(ij))^+ \\
&\quad + \sum_{s \in S} r(s)(D(0, p_s) - D(0, p'_s) + 1/2) - c(\delta\{a^+\})/2.
\end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show that

$$|\delta X \cap A_{ij}|/2 = D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) + 1 \quad (ij \in E_>), \tag{3.13}$$

$$|\delta X \cap A_{ij}|/2 = (D(p'_i, p'_j) - a(ij))^+ \quad (ij \in E_=), \tag{3.14}$$

$$|\delta X \cap \{a^+ s^+, s^- a^-\}|/2 = D(0, p_s) - D(0, p'_s) + 1/2 \quad (s \in S). \tag{3.15}$$

Pick $ij \in E_= \cup E_>$.

Case 1: $i \in U_s$, $j \in U_s \cup U_0$ and $D(0, p_i) > D(0, p_j)$. If $j \in U_0$, then $j^{s\pm}$ is denoted by $j^\pm$. Suppose $ij \in E_=$ (to show (3.14)). If $\{i^+, i^-, j^+, j^-\} \cap X$ is empty or contains i^- or j^+, then $\delta X \cap A_{ij}$ is empty, $D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) \le 0$ and hence $(D(p'_i, p'_j) - a(ij))^+ = 0$. If $\{i^+, i^-, j^+, j^-\} \cap X = \{i^+\}$ or $\{j^-\}$, then $|\delta X \cap A_{ij}| = 1$, $D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) = 1/2$, and $(D(p'_i, p'_j) - a(ij))^+ = 1/2$. If $\{i^+, i^-, j^+, j^-\} \cap X = \{i^+, j^-\}$, then $|\delta X \cap A_{ij}| = 2$,

$D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) = 1$, and $(D(p'_i, p'_j) - a(ij))^+ = 1$. Suppose $ij \in E_>$ (to show (3.13)). If $\{i^+, i^-, j^+, j^-\} \cap X = \{i^+, j^+\}$, $\{i^-, j^-\}$ or empty, then $|\delta X \cap A_{ij}| = 2$, $D(p'_i, p'_j) = D(p_i, p_j)$, and $D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) + 1 = 1$. If $\{i^+, i^-, j^+, j^-\} \cap X = \{i^+\}$ or $\{j^-\}$, then $|\delta X \cap A_{ij}| = 3$, $D(p'_i, p'_j) = D(p_i, p_j) + 1/2$, and $D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) + 1 = 3/2$. If $\{i^+, i^-, j^+, j^-\} \cap X = \{i^-\}$ or $\{j^+\}$, then $|\delta X \cap A_{ij}| = 1$, $D(p'_i, p'_j) = D(p_i, p_j) - 1/2$, and $D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) + 1 = 1/2$. If $\{i^+, i^-, j^+, j^-\} \cap X = \{i^+, j^-\}$, then $|\delta X \cap A_{ij}| = 4$, $D(p'_i, p'_j) = D(p_i, p_j) + 1$, and $D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) + 1 = 2$. If $\{i^+, i^-, j^+, j^-\} \cap X = \{i^-, j^+\}$, then $|\delta X \cap A_{ij}| = 0$, $D(p'_i, p'_j) = D(p_i, p_j) - 1$, and $D(p'_i, p'_j) - D(p_i, p_j) + 1 = 0$.

Case 2: $i \in U_s$ and $j \in U_{s'}$. In this case, (3.13) and (3.14) are obtained by replacing roles of j^+ and j^- in the above case 1.

Next consider terminal $s \in S$ (to show (3.15)). If $X \cap \{s^+, s^-\} = \{s^+\}$, then $D(0, p'_s) = D(0, p_s) + 1/2$ and $\delta X \cap \{a^+s^+, s^-a^-\}$ is empty. If $X \cap \{s^+, s^-\} = \{s^-\}$, then $D(0, p'_s) = D(0, p_s) - 1/2$ and $|\delta X \cap \{a^+s^+, s^-a^-\}| = 2$. If $X \cap \{s^+, s^-\}$ is empty, then $D(0, p'_s) = D(0, p_s)$ and $|\delta X \cap \{a^+s^+, s^-a^-\}| = 1$. For all cases, (3.15) holds.

(2). The equality $c(\delta X) = c(\delta X_1) + c(\delta X_2) - c(\delta\{a^+\})$ follows from the fact that there is no edge between $\tilde{V}_1$ and $\tilde{V}_2$. So it suffices to show that minimal minimum (a^+, a^-)-cut X satisfies the conditions (2) and (3) of legal cuts.

Suppose (for contradiction) that X contains $\{i^+, i^-\}$ or $\{i^{s+}, i^{s-}\}$. Remove all such pairs of nodes from X to obtain another (a^+, a^-)-cut X'. Observe that $|A_{ij} \cap \delta X| \geq |A_{ij} \cap \delta X'|$ for each $ij \in E_= \cup E_>$, and $|\{a^+s^+, s^-a^-\} \cap \delta X| \geq |\{a^+s^+, s^-a^-\} \cap \delta X'|$ for each terminal s. Moreover $\delta X'$ does not contain edge $i^{s+}i^{s'-}$ (of infinite capacity). Otherwise $i^{s+}, i^{s'-}, i^{s'+} \in X \not\ni i^{s-}$, and δX has edge $i^{s'+}i^{s-}$ of infinite capacity; a contradiction. Thus X' is also a minimum cut, contradicting the minimality of X. Thus δX cannot contain both i^+ (i^{s+}) and i^- (i^{s-}). Suppose for contradiction that X contains i^{s-} and does not contain $i^{s'+}$ for each $s' \in S \setminus \{s\}$. In this case, remove i^{s-} from X. Then the cut capacity does not increase, contradicting the minimality of X. Hence X satisfies (2) and (3), as required. □

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Takuro Fukunaga for communicating [9], Vladimir Kolmogorov for helpful comments on the earlier version of this paper, and the referee for helpful comments. The work was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 25280004, 26330023, 26280004.

References

[1] R. K. Ahuja, D. S. Hochbaum, and J. B. Orlin, A cut-based algorithm for the nonlinear dual of the minimum cost network flow problem, *Algorithmica* **39** (2004), 189–208.

[2] E. Anshelevich and A. Karagiozova, Terminal backup, 3D matching, and covering cubic graphs, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **40** (2011), 678–708.

[3] A. Bernáth, Y. Kobayashi, and T. Matsuoka, The generalized terminal backup problem, EGRES, TR-2013-07, 2013 (the extended abstract in SODA'13).

[4] B. V. Cherkasski, A solution of a problem of multicommodity flows in a network. *Ekonomika i Matematicheskie Metody* **13** (1977), 143–151 (in Russian).

[5] P. M. Dearing, R. L. Francis, and T. J. Lowe, Convex location problems on tree networks, *Operations Research* **24** (1976), 628–642.

[6] E. Dahlhaus, D. S. Johnson, C. H. Papadimitriou, P. D. Seymour, and M. Yannakakis, The complexity of multiterminal cuts, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **23** (1994), 864–894.

[7] P. Favati and F. Tardella, Convexity in nonlinear integer programming, *Ricerca Operativa* **53** (1990), 3–44.

[8] P. Felzenszwalb, G. Pap, É. Tardos, and R. Zabih, Globally optimal pixel labeling algorithms for tree metrics, In: *Proceedings of The Twenty-Third IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'10)* (2010), pp. 3153–3160.

[9] T. Fukunaga, Approximating the generalized terminal backup problem via half-integral multiflow relaxation, In: *32nd International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS'15)* (2015), pp. 316–328. `arXiv:1409.5561`.

[10] S. Fujishige, *Submodular Functions and Optimization, 2nd Edition*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2005.

[11] S. Fujishige, Bisubmodular polyhedra, simplicial divisions, and discrete convexity, *Discrete Optimization* **12** (2014) 115–120.

[12] S. Fujishige and S. Iwata, Bisubmodular function minimization, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* **19** (2005), 1065–1073.

[13] S. Fujishige and K. Murota, Notes on L-/M-convex functions and the separation theorems, *Mathematical Programming, Series A* **88** (2000), 129–146.

[14] A. V. Goldberg and A. V. Karzanov, Scaling methods for finding a maximum free multiflow of minimum cost, *Mathematics of Operations Research* **22** (1997), 90–109.

[15] I. Gridchyn and V. Kolmogorov, Potts model, parametric maxflow and k-submodular functions, In: *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV'13)*, 2013, 2320–2327. `arXiv:1310.1771`.

[16] M. Grötschel, L. Lovász, and A. Schrijver, *Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.

[17] H. Hirai, Half-integrality of node-capacitated multiflows and tree-shaped facility locations on trees, *Mathematical Programming, Series A* **137** (2013), 503–530.

[18] H. Hirai, Discrete convexity and polynomial solvability in minimum 0-extension problems, *Mathematical Programming, Series A*, to appear (the extended abstract appeared SODA'13).

[19] H. Hirai, Discrete convexity for multiflows and 0-extensions, in: *Proceeding of 8th Japanese-Hungarian Symposium on Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications*, 2013, pp. 209–223.

[20] H. Hirai, L-convexity on graph structures, in preparation.

[21] D. S. Hochbaum, Solving integer programs over monotone inequalities in three variables: a framework for half integrality and good approximations, *European Journal of Operational Research* **140** (2002), 291–321.

[22] A. Huber and V. Kolmogorov, Towards minimizing k-submodular functions, in: *Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium on Combinatorial Optimization (ISCO'12)*, LNCS 7422, Springer, Berlin, 2012, pp. 451–462.

[23] S. Iwata, L. Fleischer, and S. Fujishige, A combinatorial strongly polynomial algorithm for minimizing submodular functions, *Journal of the ACM* **48** (2001), 761–777.

[24] S. Iwata and K. Nagano, Submodular function minimization under covering constraints, In: *Proceeding of the 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'09)* (2009), pp. 671–680.

[25] S. Iwata and M. Shigeno, Conjugate scaling algorithm for Fenchel-type duality in discrete convex optimization, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **13** (2002), 204–211.

[26] Y. Iwata, M. Wahlström, and Y. Yoshida, Half-integrality, LP-branching and FPT Algorithms, `arXiv:1310.2841`, the conference version appeared in SODA'14.

[27] A. W. J. Kolen, *Tree Network and Planar Rectilinear Location Theory*, CWI Tract 25, Center for Mathematics and Computer Science, Amsterdam, 1986.

[28] A. V. Karzanov, A minimum cost maximum multiflow problem, in: *Combinatorial Methods for Flow Problems*, Institute for System Studies, Moscow, 1979, pp. 138–156 (Russian).

[29] A. V. Karzanov, Minimum cost multiflows in undirected networks, *Mathematical Programming, Series A* **66** (1994), 313–324.

[30] V. Kolmogorov, Generalized roof duality and bisubmodular functions, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **160** (2012), 416–426.

[31] V. Kolmogorov, Submodularity on a tree: Unifying $L^\natural$-convex and bisubmodular functions, in: *Proceedings of the 36th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS'11)*, LNCS 6907, Springer, Berlin, 2011, pp. 400–411

[32] V. Kolmogorov and A. Shioura, New algorithms for convex cost tension problem with application to computer vision, *Discrete Optimization* **6** (2009), 378–393.

[33] V. Kolmogorov, J. Thapper, and S. Živný, The power of linear programming for general-valued CSPs, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **44** (2015), 1–36.

[34] L. Lovász, On some connectivity properties of Eulerian graphs, *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* **28** (1976), 129–138.

[35] S. T. McCormick and S. Fujishige, Strongly polynomial and fully combinatorial algorithms for bisubmodular function minimization, *Mathematical Programming, Series A* **122** (2010), 87–120.

[36] K. Murota, Discrete convex analysis, *Mathematical Programming* **83** (1998), 313–371.

[37] K. Murota, *Discrete Convex Analysis*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2003.

[38] K. Murota and A. Shioura, Exact bounds for steepest descent algorithms of L-convex function minimization, *Operations Research Letters* **42** (2014), 361–366.

[39] L. Qi, Directed submodularity, ditroids and directed submodular flows, *Mathematical Programming* **42** (1988), 579–599.

[40] A. Schrijver, A combinatorial algorithm minimizing submodular functions in strongly polynomial time, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **80** (2000), 346–355.

[41] B. C. Tansel, R. L. Francis, and T. J. Lowe, Location on networks I, II, *Management Science* **29** (1983), 498–511.

[42] J. Thapper and S. Živný, The power of linear programming for valued CSPs, in: *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'12)*, 2012, pp. 669–678.

[43] D. Xu, E. Anshelevich, and M. Chiang, On survivable access network design: complexity and algorithms, in: *Proceedings of the 27th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications, Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies (INFOCOM'08)*, 2008, pp. 186–190.

[44] V. V. Vazirani, *Approximation Algorithms*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.